



3 1761 05505724 4







ORIGINES KALENDARLÆ HELLENICÆ;

OR,

THE HISTORY

OF

THE PRIMITIVE CALENDAR

AMONG THE GREEKS,

BEFORE AND AFTER THE LEGISLATION OF SOLON.

BY

EDWARD GRESWELL, B.D.

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

---

IN SIX VOLUMES.

---

VOLUME V.

---

OXFORD:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

M.DCCC.LXII.



5335  
29/9/40

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# ORIGINES KALENDARIAE HELLENICÆ.

---

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME V.

---

### DISSERTATION VI.

On the Dionysia, and the Dionysos, of Classical Antiquity ;  
and on the Dionysian Correction of Melampus.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

- SECT. I. On the method proposed to be observed in treating of the Dionysia .. .. . page 1
- II. On the distinction between the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies of Dionysos, and the Dionysia in that of the Dramatic exhibitions of classical antiquity .. .. . page 2
- III. On the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies, according to the rule of later times.
- i. Cycle of the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies .. page 4
  - ii. Season of the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies .. page 7
  - iii. Seat of the Dionysia, in the sense of the Orgies, in the old Octaëteric Calendar .. .. . page 10
- IV. On the Dionysia in the sense of the Scenic representations of classical antiquity .. .. . page 18
- V. On the Scenic Dionysia of the Athenians in particular.
- i. Number and Names of the Dionysia in this sense at Athens. .. .. . page 19
  - ii. Season of the year of these different kinds of the Scenic Dionysia at Athens respectively .. .. . page 21
  - iii. Calendar-dates of these different kinds of Scenic Dionysia at Athens respectively .. .. . page 23
  - iv. On the reconciliation of these different dates with each other .. .. . page 24
  - v. On the identity of the Dionysia *Ἀθήναια*, or *Ἐν Λίμναις*, with the *Ἀνθεστήρια* .. .. . page 28
  - vi. On the comparative antiquity of the three kinds of *Διονύσια*, in the sense of the Dramatic representations at Athens .. .. . page 29

- vii. On the date of the destruction of Helike and Bura; and of the appearance of the comet, simultaneously with it: and on that of the Dionysia ἐν ἄγροισι deducible from both .. .. . page 38
- viii. On the number of days for which the Scenic representations at Athens lasted .. .. . page 49
- SECT. VI. On the Dionysia, in quarters distinct from Athens .. page 52
- VII. Cases of the Διονύσια elsewhere than at Athens, B. C. 346 page 54

---

## CHAPTER II.

On the Dionysos of Hellenic antiquity; on the author of the Dionysia; and on the Dionysian Correction of the Primitive Calendar.

- SECT. I. On the traditionary account of the introduction of the name and worship of the Hellenic Dionysos, and of the institution of the Dionysia .. .. . page 58
- II. On the era of Melampus, and the mode of determining it page 59
- III. On the number of the Dionysi of antiquity; and on the opinions entertained concerning them .. .. . page 76
- IV. On the etymon and meaning of the name of Διόνυσος .. page 80
- V. On the Correction of the Primitive Calendar, and the introduction of the worship of Deunus and Durgha, in India, B. C. 1306. page 84
- VI. On the quarter from which Melampus obtained his knowledge of the Indian Deunus .. .. . page 91
- VII. On the probable motive to the introduction of the worship of Dionysos among the Greeks .. .. . page 93
- VIII. On the probable date of the introduction of the name and worship of Dionysos; and of the Correction of the Primitive Calendar which accompanied it .. .. . page 97
- IX. Scheme of the Cyclico-Julian Correction, or Dionysian Calendar, of Melampus, in the Period of 120 Julian and 120 Equable years respectively, from B. C. 1230 to B. C. 510 .. .. . page 105
- X. On the transfer of the Dionysia of Melampus from the 12th of the 8th month in the Primitive Calendar B. C. 592, to the 12th of the second in the Correction of Solon.. .. . page 106
- XI. On the association of the Phallus with the Dionysia of Melampus. page 113
- Testimonies to the use of the Phallus among the Egyptians and the Greeks .. .. . page 114

---

## CHAPTER III.

On the Theban Dionysos, or the Dionysos of the popular Hellenic mythology; on the foundation of Thebes by Cadmus; and on the sphere of Cadmus.

- SECT. I. Dionysos, the son of Zeus and Semele, a fictitious character, of later date than the Dionysos of Melampus .. .. . page 118
- II. On the time of Cadmus, and of his coming into Greece.. page 123
- III. On the quarter from which Cadmus came into Greece.. page 127



SECT. IV. On the probable origin of the opinion that Cadmus came from Phœnicia .. .. .	page 140
V. On the fable of the Dragon of Cadmus; of the teeth of the Dragon; and of the Sparti or sown men. Testimonies ..	page 144
VI. Explanation of the fable .. .. .	page 147
VII. On the Oracle given to Cadmus; and on the Cow of Cadmus.	page 154
VIII. On the Onka of Cadmus; and on the Athena of Cadmus.	page 161

## DISSERTATION VII.

On the Rhodian Corrections of the Primitive Calendar; and on the Rhodian Ἄλεια and Τληπολέμεια.

## CHAPTER I.

On the Octaëteric and the Metonic Correction of the island of Rhodes.

SECT. I. On the proper Type of the Rhodian Octaëteris ..	page 175
II. On the recovery of the names and order of the months in the Rhodian Calendar, from the <i>Inscriptiones Figulinae</i> or <i>Figlinae</i> of antiquity .. .. .	page 175
III. Order and names of the months in the Rhodian Calendar, both the Octaëteric, Jan. 7, B. C. 542, and the Metonic, May 6, B. C. 382 .. .. .	page 179
IV. On the Etymons and meaning of the names of the months in the Rhodian Calendar .. .. .	page 182
i. Ἀγριάνιος .. .. .	page 183
ii. Βαδρόμιος .. .. .	page 185
On the custom of the <i>Χελιδονισμός</i> at Rhodes ..	page 185
iii. Θευδαίσιος .. .. .	page 190
iv. Δάλιος .. .. .	page 193
v. Ἀρταμίτιος .. .. .	page 195
vi. Πάναμος .. .. .	page 198
vii. Πεδαγείτννος .. .. .	page 198
viii. Ἰακίνθιος .. .. .	page 203
ix. Καρνείος .. .. .	page 206
x. Θεσμοφόριος .. .. .	page 207
xi. Σμίνθιος .. .. .	page 208
xii. Διόσθνος .. .. .	page 215
V. On the change in the beginning of the official year, and in the Cycle of the Calendar, at Rhodes, B. C. 382 .. .. .	page 219
VI. Confirmation of the change from B. C. 382 downwards, by historical proofs.	
i. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 171 .. .. .	page 223
ii. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 48 .. .. .	page 224
iii. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 43 .. .. .	page 225
iv. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 42 .. .. .	page 227
VII. On the Julian Calendar of Rhodes .. .. .	page 228

## CHAPTER II.

- On the Cyclico-Julian Correction of the island of Rhodes; and on the Julian date of the Rhodian Ἄλεια and Τληπολέμεια.
- SECT. I. On the opinions and the institutions connected with the Cyclico-Julian Corrections of antiquity. . . . . page 235
- II. On the local tradition and belief concerning the origin of the island of Rhodes . . . . . page 238
- III. On the local tradition concerning the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes . . . . . page 241
- IV. On the etymon and meaning of the name of Ῥόδος . . . . . page 244
- V. On the Βαλαύστιον, or Mystical Emblem, of the Rhodian Cosmogony . . . . . page 247
- VI. On the probable date of the Cyclico-Julian Correction of Rhodes . . . . . page 251
- VII. On the Rhodian Colony under Tlepolemus; and on the Rhodian Τληπολέμεια . . . . . page 254
- VIII. On the confirmation of the preceding conclusions by some general considerations . . . . . page 260
- IX. On the Athena of Lindus, and the local tradition concerning the first sacrifice in Rhodes to the Lindian Athena . . . . . page 263
- X. On the Τελχίνες of Rhodian Mythology . . . . . page 269
- XI. On the Ἡλιάδαι of Rhodian Mythology . . . . . page 280

## CHAPTER III.

- On the Chronology of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, and the testimony to the Calendar of Rhodes, rendered by it.
- SECT. I. On the interest attaching to the Argonautica, as one of the few surviving Epic Poems of classical antiquity . . . . . page 284
- II. On the Chronology of the Argonautica in particular, and the point of view in which it is proposed to regard it . . . . . page 286
- III. On the length of time taken up by the Action of the Argonautica, and on the two classes of notes of time discoverable in it . . . . . page 287
- IV. On the Solar Calendar of the Argonautica.
- i. First Criterion . . . . . page 288
- ii. Second Criterion . . . . . page 289
- iii. Third Criterion . . . . . page 291
- iv. General conclusion from the above premises . . . . . page 294
- V. On the Civil Calendar of the Argonautica; and whether Solar or Lunar in general . . . . . page 295
- i. First Criterion of the Calendar of the Argonautica, as Lunar in general . . . . . page 297
- ii. Second Criterion of the Calendar of the Argonautica, as Lunar in general. . . . . page 300
- iii. On some other Criteria of the Calendar of the Argonautica, as Lunar in general . . . . . page 304
- VI. On the particular Lunar Calendar of the Argonautica . . . . . page 306
- i. Beginning of the civil year, as recognised in the Argonautica . . . . . page 307
- ii. Identity of the Calendar of the Argonautica with the Calendar of Rhodes . . . . . page 309

SECT. VII. On the date of the commencement of the voyage of the Argonauts.	
i. Suspension of the chronological rule of the Argonautica after the departure from the Phasis; and course supposed to have been taken by the Argonauts on their return ..	page 311
ii. Resumption of the chronological rule of the Argonautica ..	page 315
iii. Date of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis ..	page 316
iv. Chronology of the Argonautica from the day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis to that of the arrival at Pagasæ .. .. .	page 318
v. Date of the commencement of the voyage of the Argonauts ..	page 320
vi. Length of the interval passed in Lemnos ..	page 324
VIII. On the date of the Argonautic Expedition adopted by Apollonius ..	page 325
IX. Chronology of the Argonautica.	
Part i. From the beginning of the voyage to the arrival in Paphlagonia, on the return .. .. .	page 329
Part ii. From the day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis to the day of the landing at Pagasæ .. .. .	page 332
X. Inferences from the preceding review, illustrative of the calendars or of the customs of classical antiquity .. .. .	page 333
i. Lemnian calendar of the time of Apollonius ..	page 333
ii. Date of the Samothracian mysteries .. ..	page 335
iii. Relation of the Calendar of Kyzicus to the Rhodian; and date of the Parentalia to the Manes of Kyzicus there ..	page 336
iv. Consecration of the Lunar Numeniæ to all the gods ..	page 339
v. Date of the appearance of Apollo 'Εἰώος; and Lycian calendar of Apollonius' time .. .. .	page 340
vi. Calendar of Coreyra in the time of Apollonius; and date of the sacrifice founded by Medea in Coreyra ..	page 341
vii. Calendar of Anaphe, and date of the sacrifice to Apollo Αἰγλήτης .. .. .	page 342
viii. Date of the Ὑδροφῶρια at Ægina .. ..	page 344

## DISSERTATION VIII.

### On the Parthenian Ennead of the Bœotians.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### On the Daphnephoria and Parthenia of the ancient Bœotians.

SECT. I. Testimonies .. .. .	page 346
II. On the return of the Bœotians to Thebes, from Arne in Thessaly; and its time .. .. .	page 348
III. Thucydides' date of the Capture of Troy .. .. .	page 351
IV. On the nature of the Parthenian Ennead; and on its connection with the proper Lunar Cycle of the Primitive Solar year ..	page 353

SECT. V. On the historical date of the institution of the <i>Κωπώ</i> ; and on its Epoch in the Primitive and the Julian calendar ..	page 358
VI. On the Cycle of the Parthenian Ennead in the <i>Apis Cycle</i> ..	page 362
VII. On the relation of the Parthenian Ennead to the Bœotian Correction, B. C. 567; and on the date of the <i>Κωπώ</i> in that ..	page 365
VIII. Confirmation of the preceding conclusions by some other considerations.	
i. Relation of the Parthenian Ennead to the Primitive <i>Apis Cycle</i> .. .. .	page 368
ii. Decorations of the <i>Κωπώ</i> ; and the Apollo <i>Χαλάζιος</i> , to whom it was dedicated .. .. .	page 370
iii. The <i>Παρθένια</i> , or <i>Παρθένεια</i> .. .. .	page 372
iv. The <i>Δαφνηφορία</i> older at Thebes than the Parthenian Ennead .. .. .	page 374
IX. On the probable motive to the institution of the Parthenian Ennead, and on the Fable of <i>Tityus</i> .. .. .	page 375

## DISSERTATION IX.

### On the Carnea of Hellenic Antiquity, and the Carnean Ennead.

#### CHAPTER I.

SECT. I. Testimonies. .. .. .	page 381
II. Observations on the preceding testimonies; and inferences from them .. .. .	page 385
III. On the date of the return of the Heraclidæ .. .. .	page 390
IV. On the institution of the Carnean Ennead along with the Carnea, B. C. 1096 .. .. .	page 391
V. On the stated season of the Carnea in the natural year; and on the Julian Epoch of the Carnean Ennead .. .. .	page 397
VI. On the Carnean <i>Feria</i> , or the number of days for which the Carnea lasted .. .. .	page 400
VII. On the Carnean Epoch in the Octaëteric Correction of the Spartans, B. C. 592 .. .. .	page 406
VIII. On the cases of the Carnea, older than B. C. 592 .. .. .	page 409
IX. On the cases of the Carnea, later than B. C. 592 .. .. .	page 410
i. B. C. 480 .. .. .	page 410
ii. B. C. 436 .. .. .	page 411
iii. B. C. 419 .. .. .	page 412
iv. B. C. 418 .. .. .	page 420
v. Rule of the Carnea in the Syracusan Calendar; and date of the Syracusan Carnea B. C. 413 .. .. .	page 421
vi. Rule of the Carnea in the Calendar of Cyrene .. .. .	page 424
vii. Cycle of the Carnean Ennead B. C. 240 .. .. .	page 424

## DISSERTATION X.

## On the Hyakinthian or Amyclean Eunead.

## CHAPTER I.

- SECT. I. On the rule of the Hyakinthia in the Spartan Calendar, from B. C. 592 downwards .. .. . page 428
- II. On the Calendar-dates of the three Hyakinthian *Feriae* .. page 431
- III. On the Calendar-dates of the Hyakinthian *Feriae*, and on their relation to the moon, B. C. 479 .. .. . page 436
- IV. On the original Epoch of the Hyakinthia, and on the date of their institution .. .. . page 438
- V. On the historical occasion of the institution of the Hyakinthia .. .. . page 441
- VI. On the original Lunar dates of the Hyakinthian *Feriae*, the Luna sexta, the Luna septima, and the Luna octava .. page 449
- VII. Amyclean or Hyakinthian Octaëteris. In four Types, 160 years asunder, from B. C. 1072 to B. C. 592 .. .. . page 452
- VIII. On the original date of the first of the Hyakinthian *Feriae*; and on the connection of the institution with the personal history of Hyakinthus .. .. . page 452
- IX. On the cases of the Hyakinthia mentioned in history, before or after B. C. 592 .. .. . page 463
- X. On the *Γυμνοπαίδαι* of the Spartans, and its Calendar-date .. .. . page 466

## DISSERTATION XI.

## On the Cronia or Olympia of Hellenic antiquity; on the Cronian Calendar of Pelops; and on the Olympic and the Civil Calendar respectively of Elis.

## CHAPTER I.

- SECT. I. On the relative antiquity and order of the principal Games of the Greeks .. .. . page 472
- II. On the Games of the Period, properly so called .. .. . page 476
- i. Number, Names, and respective Authors of the Games of the Period .. .. . page 476
- ii. Prizes at the Games of the Period .. .. . page 481
- III. On the Olympic Calendar; or the particular Calendar by which the Olympia were celebrated .. .. . page 484
- IV. On the Olympic Rule of later times, and its proper Characters .. .. . page 490
- i. First Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic *Season* .. .. . page 490
- ii. Second Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic *Cycle* .. .. . page 496

- iii. Third Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic *Feriv*  
page 501
- iv. Fourth Character of the Olympic Rule, the Calendar-dates  
of the Olympic *Feriv*, and their relation to the *Moon*  
page 501
- SECT. V. On the relation of the Four Characters of the Olympic Rule to  
the different kinds of the Civil Calendar at different times in  
use among the Greeks .. .. . page 507

## CHAPTER II.

On the Date of the Institution, the Date of the Restoration, and the  
Date of the Historical Commemoration of the Olympic Games.

- SECT. I. On the reputed authors of the Olympic Institution .. page 509
- II. On the personal history, and the chronology of the life, of Pelops  
page 510
- III. On the Foundation of the Olympic Solemnity; and whether it is  
to be ascribed to Pelops or to Hercules .. .. page 522
- IV. On the original idea of the Olympic Institution, as deducible from  
the Characters of the Olympic Rule .. .. . page 529
- V. On the Equable and Julian date of the Olympic Institution of Pelops,  
Epagomenê 1, Æra Cyclica 2742, June 25, B. C. 1264  
page 534
- VI. Confirmation of the date of the Olympic Institution of Pelops by  
other and distinct arguments .. .. . page 537
- VII. Scheme of the Cronian, or Olympian, Calendar of Pelops, for  
each of the years of its proper Cycle of Leap-year .. page 547
- VIII. On the Olympia ascribed to Hercules; and on the nature and  
date of the change made by him in the Cronian Institution of  
Pelops .. .. . page 547
- IX. On the Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus, and its date page 560
- X. On the first Historical Olympiad, B. C. 776 .. .. page 569

## CHAPTER III.

On the Lunar Calendar of Elis.

- SECT. I. On the identity of the first Type of the Lunar Correction at Elis  
with the Attic Correction of Solon .. .. . page 574
- II. On the date of the adoption of the Lunar Calendar for the regula-  
tion of the Olympic Games .. .. . page 576
- III. On the liability of the Olympic *Feriv* in their proper Lunar Calen-  
dar to follow the Moon .. .. . page 578
- IV. On the Olympiad of Cleisthenes, and the inference from it, respect-  
ing the dates of successive cycles of the Olympic Octaëteris  
page 583
- V. On the second Type of the Lunar Correction at Elis, or the Metonic  
Calendar of Elis, and its beginning .. .. . page 585
- VI. On the names and order of the months in the Calendar of Elis  
page 590
- VII. On the probable date of the adoption of the Metonic Correction  
for the regulation of the Olympic Games; and on the Olympic  
*Terms* in that Correction .. .. . page 594
- VIII. On the Civil Calendar of Elis, as distinct from the Olympic  
page 597

## CHAPTER IV.

On the verification of the Olympic Calendar of the *Origines Kalendarie Hellenicæ*.

SECT. I.	i.	Olympiad lxxxviii. B. C. 428	..	..	..	..	page 600
	ii.	Olympiad cvi. B. C. 356	..	..	..	..	page 601
	iii.	Olympiad clxxxiv. B. C. 44	..	..	..	..	page 602
	iv.	Olympiad ccxxxvi. A. D. 165	..	..	..	..	page 607
II.		On the final cessation of the Olympic Games ; and on the Olympia of Antioch	..	..	..	..	page 613

## DISSERTATION XII.

On the Pythian Games of Antiquity, and on the Lunar Calendar of Delphi.

## CHAPTER I.

On the institution of the Pythian Games, and on the author of the institution.

SECT. I.		On the original Cycle of the Pythian Games	..	..	..	..	page 625
II.		On the traditionary author of the Pythian Institution, or Pythian Chorus. Testimonies	..	..	..	..	page 626
SECT. III.		Inferences from the preceding Testimonies	..	..	..	..	page 628
IV.		On the fable of the Pytho ; of the Pythian Apollo ; and of the Pythian Oracle. Testimonies	..	..	..	..	page 634
V.		Observations upon the preceding Testimonies, and inferences from them	..	..	..	..	page 642
	i.	Final end of the Pythian Fable	..	..	..	..	page 642
	ii.	The Pytho of the Fable the Type of a Lunæ solar Cycle of eight years ; and the original Pythian Period an Octæteric Cycle	..	..	..	..	page 645
VI.		On the etymon of the names of Πύθων, Ἀπόλλων, Ἄρτεμις, and Λατώ, respectively	..	..	..	..	page 656
VII.		On the Oracle at Delphi, and its traditionary history before the Pythian Institution	..	..	..	..	page 672

## CHAPTER II.

On the recovery of the *Epoch* of the Pythian Institution, and the Pythian Cycle, of Philammon.

SECT. I.		On the <i>Epoch</i> in terms of the Month. Sacredness of the <i>seventh</i> day among the ancient Greeks, and the reason on which it was founded	..	..	..	..	page 678
II.		Traditionary date of the birth of Apollo, whether the seventh of the lunar, or the seventh of the solar, month	..	..	..	..	page 684
III.		On the <i>Epoch</i> in terms of the Year. Fable of the Dragon and the Sparrows in Homer, and the historical fact implied thereby	..	..	..	..	page 687
IV.		On the <i>Epoch</i> in terms both of the Year and of the Day	..	..	..	..	page 693

- V. On the confirmation of the *Epoch* of the Pythian Institution, *August 26*, in general, by the testimony of the Poet Alkæus page 697
- VI. On the relation of the Pythian Cycle of Philammon to the Cretan Cycle of Minos .. .. . page 699
- VII. On the Lunar Character of the Cycle of Philammon; and on the relation of *August 26 B. C. 1222* to the Primitive Solar and the Primitive Lunar Calendar .. .. . page 703
- VIII. On the dates of the births of Apollo and Artemis in later times; and on the fable of their birth at Delos .. .. . page 708
- IX. On the interval between the Luna Prima in the Cycle of Philammon and the Epoch of the Cycle; and on the æconomy to which it was subservient .. .. . page 712
- X. Type of the Pythian Ennead, or Octaëteric Cycle of Philammon, adapted to successive Periods of 160 years, from Period i. B. C. 1222 to Period vi. B. C. 422 .. .. . page 719
- XI. On the *Natalis* of the ancient Thessaly; and on its coincidence with the Epoch of the Pythian Institution .. .. . page 719



# ORIGINES KALENDARIÆ HELLENICÆ.

---

## DISSERTATION VI.

*On the Dionysia, and the Dionysos, of Classical Antiquity; and on the Dionysian Correction of Melampus.*

---

### CHAPTER I.

---

SECTION I.—*On the method proposed to be observed in treating of the Dionysia.*

THE Dionysia and the Thesmophoria appear to have been those two of the observances of the ancient Greeks, which were most characteristic of them. These two were as wide spread as the Hellenic name itself; nor was there perhaps a single community of Grecian extraction, howsoever small and obscure, and howsoever remote and isolated, which had not its Dionysia and Thesmophoria, in common with the rest, and celebrated more or less according to the same rule. These two solemnities in particular were the most ancient of the national rites and ceremonies of the Greeks: and being in honour of cognate and correlative principles, predisposed to coalesce with, or to accompany one another, one as the impersonation of a masculine, the other as that of a feminine, idea of the same kind in general, they naturally went together; and wheresoever the one had been introduced, there the other, in the course of time, if not from the first, came to be introduced also.

The Thesmophoria indeed were older than the Dionysia; and the name and idea of the Demeter of the former were

older than those of the Dionysos of the latter: yet the fact still holds good that the idea of the latter having once been conceived as something necessary to the complete realisation of the former, both were ever after associated in the minds of men, as objects of worship which from the nature of things must go together. The Thesmophoria too, at their first institution, having been attached to a particular season of the year, the Dionysia, as first introduced, appear to have been attached to this season of the Thesmophoria. Nor is there any reason to suppose that both these institutions were not intended by their respective authors to continue attached to it, so that, from the time when both were in existence at once, the celebration of both might go on simultaneously, or that of the one directly after that of the other. The rule of the Thesmophoria also, in this respect<sup>n</sup>, never experienced any material alteration; that of the Dionysia appears to have been so modified by the course of time, that we find at last the stated time of the same, or a similar ceremony, (of one called by the name of the Dionysia at least,) at the opposite season of the year to that of the Thesmophoria. Proposing therefore to investigate the history of this ancient Greek institution, and to connect, if possible, its rule *de facto* at last with its rule *de facto* at first, we shall perhaps, under the circumstances of the case, be most likely to succeed, if we trace it backwards; i. e. begin with ascertaining the rule of the observance in comparatively later times, in the hope of finding it instrumental to the discovery of that of earlier.

SECTION II.—*On the distinction between the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies of Dionysos, and the Dionysia in that of the Dramatic exhibitions of classical antiquity.*

Preliminary however to this undertaking, it is necessary to draw an important distinction in the sense and meaning of this word (that of the *Διονύσια*) itself. The proper meaning of such a term in Greek is τὰ τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερά, the rites or ceremonies of Dionysos; in Latin the *Sacra Liberi Patris*: and in this sense and this relation the *Διονύσια* were the same with Ὀργια, the name which the Greeks gave to the

<sup>n</sup> Cf. Vol. iv. 478. Dissertation ii.

characteristic rites and ceremonies of this one of their objects of worship, because of the effects which they produced in those who took part in them; the violent emotions which they excited, the outbursts of passion, and even of rage and fury, with which they were accompanied. For that this is the true explanation of the name of the "Ὀργια, from ὄργη—*impetus, ira, furor*—there can be no reasonable doubt; though some of the etymologists of antiquity derive it from ἔργον, as if from the idea of some *stated work or service*; an explanation, which would render the name of the Orgies as applicable to the rites and ceremonies of any of the gods of classical antiquity as to those of Dionysos; whereas it is certain that the proper and classical use of the term is restricted to the services of Dionysos only, or extended to those of no other object of worship besides, but one whose proper ceremonies were characterised by the same excitement and enthusiasm as his.

One sense of the Διονύσια then is that of the "Ὀργια, the characteristic rites and services of Διόνυσος; and this must have been its first and proper meaning. Another is that of the scenic representations of antiquity, the Dionysia understood of the exhibitions of tragedy or comedy at stated times among the Greeks of old. Exhibitions of that kind were classed by the ancients under the general denomination of Διονυσιακοὶ ἀγῶνες: Τῶν δὲ ἀγόνων οἱ μὲν γυμνικοὶ, οἱ δὲ καλούμενοι σκηνικοὶ ὀνομασθεῖεν ἂν Διονυσιακοὶ τε καὶ μουσικοί<sup>ο</sup>: and the ὑποκριταὶ or actors in them were best known by the name of the τεχνῖται Διανυσιακοὶ also. *This sense of the term, it is evident, must have been entirely secondary in comparison of the former: and must have grown up out of an accidental association of things between which there was no necessary connection—the rites and ceremonies in honour of Dionysos, and the dramatic representations, or any other kind of poetical exhibitions. Nor would it perhaps be difficult to explain out of what concurrence of circumstances it might have arisen; and something may require to be said on that subject as we proceed. At present it is sufficient to have reminded the reader that this term Διονύσια, in the common*

<sup>ο</sup> Pollux, iii. xxx. § 142. p. 340.

use of it among the Greeks, had a double meaning, one, that of the *Orgies*, the other, that of the *Scenic Exhibitions* of classical antiquity, between which, it is evident, there could never have been any necessary connection; and if there was an actual one, it must have been in the first instance *per accidens*, or by virtue of an arbitrary and positive association. We must therefore ourselves treat them as distinct; and if we are to take them in the order of time, we must begin with the *Dionysia*, in the sense of the *Orgies*.

SECTION III.—*On the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies, according to the rule of later times.* i. *Cycle of the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies.*

The *Ὀργια* or Rites of Dionysos, the *Διονύσια* properly so called, wheresoever and howsoever celebrated among the Greeks, appear to have been subjected to one and the same rule; that of being celebrated every *third* year. The cycle of the *Orgies* was consequently a period of two years complete.

i. Dionysos multos habemus ... quintum ... a quo trieterides constitutæ putantur<sup>p</sup>—Unde mysteria quæ Libero Patri alternis fiunt annis trieterica a poetis dicuntur<sup>q</sup>—Trieterica hujusmodi sacra quidam existimant adpellari<sup>r</sup>—Καὶ τῶ θεῶ τριετηρίδες ἄγονται ἑορταί<sup>s</sup>—Αἱ μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ τριετηρίδες ἀφίκοντο<sup>t</sup>—

Ὡς δὲ τὰ μὲν τρία σοι, πάντως τριετηρίσιν αἰεὶ  
ἄνθρωποι ῥέξουσιν τελέησσας ἑκατομβάς<sup>v</sup>—

Εἰς δὲ χορεύματα  
συνῆψαν τριετηρίδων,  
αἷς χαίρει Διόνυσος<sup>x</sup>.

Ὅκ ἐθέλω τριετῆ σὲ τανῦν Ὀρίβακχον αἰεῖειν,  
οὐ χορὸν Ἀονίου παρὰ βένθεσιν Ἀσωποῖο.  
λείψομαι, ὡς κέλει, τὰ σαβάξια νύκτερα θύσθλα<sup>y</sup>  
δηθάκις ἀμφεχόρευσα Θουναίῳ Διονύσῳ<sup>y</sup>—

<sup>p</sup> Cicero, De Natura Deorum, iii. 23, 58. cf. De Legibus, ii. 15, 37. Also Lydus, De Mensibus, iv. 38. 72. l. 11-73. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Censorius, De Die Nat. xviii.

<sup>r</sup> Ammianus Marcell. xxii. 8. 300.

<sup>s</sup> Artemidorus, Oneirocritica, iv. 41.

<sup>t</sup> Ælian, Varr. Histor. xiii. 2.

<sup>v</sup> Hymni Hom. κς'. In Dionyson, l. 11.

<sup>x</sup> Euripides, Bacchæ, 132.

<sup>y</sup> Oppian, Kynegetica, i. 24.

Οὐ θῆρες βλοσυροὶ χαροπαὶ δ' ἐπέλοντο γυναῖκες,  
οἰνάδες ὄσχοφόροι τριετηρίδες ἀνθοκάρηνοι,  
Βάκχου φοιταλιῆος ἐγερσιχώροιο τιθῆναι z—

Τιμὰς τευξαμένη παρ' ἀγαυῆς Περσεφονείης  
ἐν θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν ἀνὰ τριετηρίδας ὥρας,  
ἡνίκα σοῦ Βάκχου γονίμην ὠδίνα τελῶσιν a.

᾽Ωμάδιε, σκηπτοῦχε, χορομανές, ἡγέτα κώμων  
βακχεύων ἀγίας τριετηρίδας ἀμφὶ γαληνάς b.

᾽Αμφιετῆ καλέω Βάκχον, χθόνιον Διόνυσον,  
ἐγρόμενον κούραις ἅμα νύμφαις εὐπλοκάμοισιν  
ὅς παρὰ Περσεφόνης ἱεροῖσι δόμοισιν λαύων  
κοιμίζει τριετῆρα χρόνον Βακχίῳ ἀγόν.  
αὐτὸς δ' ἡνίκα τὸν τριετῆ πάλι κῶμον ἐγείρη,  
εἰς ᾽ἕμνον τρέπεται σὺν ἐϋζώνοισι τιθήναις,  
εὐάζων, κινῶν τε χοροὺς ἐνὶ κυκλάσιν ὥραις c.

Κλυθί μεν .. ..  
Σιληνῶν ὄχ' ἄριστε, τιτιμένε πᾶσι θεοῖσιν  
καὶ θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν ἐπὶ τριετηρίσιν ὥραις d.

ii. De Gelonis (Greeks originally, settled in Scythia):  
Καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ τριετηρίδας ἀνάγουσι καὶ βακχεύουσι e—Αἱ δὲ  
Θυιάδες γυναῖκες μὲν εἰσιν Ἀπτικάι, φοιτῶσαι δὲ ἐς τὸν Παρ-  
νασσὸν παρὰ ἔτος, αὐταὶ τε καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες Δελφῶν, ἄγουσιν ὄργια  
Διονύσῳ f—In hoc monte Parnaso Bacchanalia alternis agun-  
tur annis g—*De Libero Patre* h: Itaque post annum tertium  
cum eo redit in gratiam, simulatque in regno se sacra facere  
velle quæ trieterica dicuntur, quoniam post tertium annum  
faciebat i—

Mons Phæbo Bromioque sacer, cui numine mixto  
Delphica Thebanæ referunt trieterica Bacchæ k—

Qualis commotis excita sacris  
Thyias, ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho l—

z Oppian, *Kynegetica*, iv. 234. De  
Leopardis. cf. iv. 248–250.

a Orphica, xlv. *Σεμέλης*, 6. cf. xlv.

f *Ἔμνος Διονύσου Βασσαρέως τριετηρικοῦ*.

b Ibid. lii. *Τριετηρικοῦ*, 7.

c Ibid. liii. *Ἀμφιετοῦς*, 1.

d Ibid. liv. *Σιληνοῦ*, 1.

e Herodotus. iv. 108.

f Pausanias, x. iv. 2. cf. xxxii. 5.

g Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i. 18. 299.

h Hyginus, *Fabb.* cxxxii. Nysos.

i Cf. Diodorus, iv. 3. (Eusebius,  
*Præp. Evang.* ii. 2. 115. § 5.) of the  
origin of these *τριετηρίδες* out of the  
supposed Indian expedition of Diony-  
sos. Also Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. vi. 1.  
the *τριετηρικὴ παντέλεια*—a mystical  
ceremony at Athens, in honour of Dio-  
nysos.

k Lucan, *Pharsalia*, v. 73.

l *Æneid.* iv. 301.

*Trieterica* : Triennialia. Liberi enim sacra tertio quoque anno innovabantur <sup>m</sup>—

Ibat, ut Edono referens trieterica Baccho  
Ire solet fisis barbãra turba comis <sup>n</sup>—

Tempus erat, quo sacra solent trieterica Bacchi  
Sithoniã celebrare nurus : nox conscia sacris <sup>o</sup>—

Utque tuo motã, proles Semeleia, thyrso  
Ismariã celebrant repetita triennia Bacchã ;  
Byblida non aliter <sup>p</sup>—

Edonis ut Pangãea super trieteride mota  
It juga, et inclusum suspirat pectore Bacchum <sup>q</sup>—

Tacita pavidum tum sede locavit  
Sub pedibus dextraque dei. latet ille receptus  
Veste sacra ; voces chorus et trieterica reddunt  
Æra sonum, fixãque fremunt in limine tigris <sup>r</sup>—

Lampsacus, Ogygii quam nec trieterica Bacchi  
Sacra <sup>s</sup>—

Non hæc trieterica vobis  
Nox patrio de more venit <sup>t</sup>—

Cum Bacchica mugit  
Buxus, et insanã maculant trieterida matres <sup>v</sup>—

Hujus in umbra  
Alternam revocare piã trieterida matres  
Consuerant <sup>x</sup>—

Non Bacchum trieterica exserentem  
Describam, et tremulas furore festo  
Ire in Bassaridas, vel infulatos  
Aram ad turicremam rotare mystas <sup>y</sup>.

And agreeably to this rule of the cycle, the Dionysia, supposed to have been in course at Thebes in the first year of the action of the Thebais of Statius <sup>z</sup>, are represented as again in course at the same time in the third year <sup>a</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Servius, in loc.

<sup>n</sup> Ovid, Remed. Amoris, 593.

<sup>o</sup> Metam. vi. 587.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. ix. 640.

<sup>q</sup> Silius Italicus, Punica, iv. 778.

<sup>r</sup> Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, ii.

257.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. ii. 624.

<sup>t</sup> Statius, Thebais, ii. 661.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. ix. 479.

<sup>x</sup> Achilleis, i. 594.

<sup>y</sup> Sidonius Apollinaris, ix. 204.

<sup>z</sup> i. 71.

<sup>a</sup> iv. 1-2 : 377-405 : cf. 652-658 :

xii. 787-794. See supra, Vol. ii. 341. 346.

SECTION III.—ii. *Season of the Dionysia in the sense of the Orgies.*

i. Winter. With regard to the season at which the Dionysia in this sense appear to have been celebrated, according to one class of testimonies it would seem to have been the winter: "Υης<sup>b</sup> ἐπιθετον Διονύσου· ὡς Κλειῶδημος· ἐπειδὴ ἐπιτελοῦμεν τὰς θυσίας αὐτῷ καθ' ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἕει χρόνον. And though this explanation of "Υης, as an epithet of Dionysos, is mistaken, (that appellation itself having been derived not from the Greek ὕω, but from the Phrygian "Υης Ἄττης) it implies notwithstanding that the stated season of the Dionysia was notoriously the rainy season, the end of the winter, or the beginning of the early spring—

Festa corymbiferi celebrabas, Græcia, Bacchi,  
Tertia quæ solito tempore bruma refert<sup>c</sup>—

Marcidus edomito bellum referebat ab Hæmo  
Liber : ibi armiferos geminæ jam sidere brumæ  
Orgia ferre Getas, canumque virescere dorso  
Othryn et Icaria Rhodopen adsueverat umbra.  
Et jam pampineos materna ad mœnia currus  
Promovet<sup>d</sup>.

Thus the Dionysia at Kynætha, in Arcadia, are represented by Pausanias<sup>e</sup> as celebrated ὥρα χειμῶνος : and a fact is mentioned by Plutarch, which happened at Delphi on some occasion, when the orgies were going on on Mount Parnassus in the depth of winter<sup>f</sup> : Ἐν δὲ Δελφοῖς αὐτὸς ἤκουεσ ὅτι τῶν εἰς τὸν Παρνασσὸν ἀναβάντων, βοηθῆσαι ταῖς Θυάσιν ἀπειλημέναισ ὑπὸ πνεύματος χαλεποῦ καὶ χιόνος, οὕτως ἐγένοντο διὰ τὸν πάγον σκληραὶ καὶ ξυλώδεισ αἱ χλαμύδεισ, ὡσ καὶ θραύεσθαι διατεινομένασ καὶ ῥήγγυσθαι.

ii. The Spring. And yet, according to another class of testimonies, it is clearly implied that they must have been celebrated in the spring. For example, the action of the Bacchæ, of Euripides, opens at the stated time of the orgies, (the first supposed to have been celebrated among the

<sup>b</sup> Etym. Magnum. cf. in Διόνυσος : Phot. Lex. "Υης : Anecdota, (207. 25.) Ἄττης "Υης : Suidas, "Υης : Eustathius, ad Il. Σ. 485 : 1155. 64.

<sup>c</sup> Ovid. Fasti, i. 393.

<sup>d</sup> Statius, Thebais, iv. 652.

<sup>e</sup> viii. xix. 1.

<sup>f</sup> De Primo Frigido, xviii.

Greeks<sup>f</sup>;) and all the allusions to the time of the year, which occur in it, are characteristic of the end of the winter and the beginning of spring<sup>g</sup>: the smilax in flower<sup>h</sup>; the flocks and herds pasturing in the open air<sup>i</sup>; the corn already sprung up by the Asopus<sup>k</sup>; serpents in active motion<sup>l</sup>; yet the snows still unmelted on Mount Kithæron<sup>m</sup>, and the winter torrents not yet dry<sup>n</sup>—

Ὀὐδ' ἐπὶ καλλιχόροις στεφάνοισι νεανίδος ὄρας  
βόστρυχον ἀμπέτασας<sup>o</sup>—

Διονύσου δὲ ὄρος ἱερὸν, Λαρύσιον καλούμενόν, ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μιγωνίου. καὶ ἦρος ἀρχομένου Διονύσου τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν, ἄλλα τε ἐς τὰ δρώμενα λέγουτες, καὶ ὡς βότρυν ἐνταῦθα ἀνευρίσκουσιν ὠραίου<sup>p</sup>—

Καί

σε Νυσαίων ὀρέων  
κισσῆρεις ὄχθαι  
χλωρά τ' ἀκτὰ πολυστάφυλος πέμπει  
ἀβρότων ἐπέων  
εὐαζόντων Θηβαίας  
ἐπισκοποῦντ' ἀγυιάς<sup>q</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Ἡ τὸ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ φησὶν ἄλσος, ἢ τὸ ἐν Παρνασσῶ· ἐν ἀμφοτέροις γὰρ τόποις ἢ ἄμπελος, ἢ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν περὶ μὲν τὴν ἕω βότρυας φέρει περὶ δὲ μεσημβρίαν ὄμφακας, ἐτρυγάτο δὲ πεπανθεῖσα περὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν<sup>r</sup>.—Ἐν Αἰγαῖς τῆς Εὐβοίας παράδοξα πολλὰ γίνονται. κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐτησίους τοῦ Διονύσου τελετὰς, ὀργιαζουσῶν τῶν μυστίδων γυναικῶν, βλαστάνουσιν αἱ καλούμεναι ἐφήμεροι ἄμπελοι, αἵτινες ἔωθεν μὲν τὰς τῶν καρπῶν ἐκβολὰς ποιοῦνται, εἶτ' αὖ πάλιν βότρυας βαρυντάτους, καὶ τούτους (ita leg.) πρὸ μεσημβρίας πεπαίνουσι· πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἑσπέραν τρεπόμεναι ἄκρατον χορηγοῦσι (ita leg.) δαψιλὲς ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ παρθένοισι κ', τ. λ.<sup>s</sup>—Αἰγαὶ δὲ πόλις Ἀχαιῖας ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ, εἴθ' αὖ τιμᾶται μὲν ὁ Ποσειδῶν, ἄγεται δὲ καὶ Διονύσῳ ἑορτὴ, ἐν ἣ ἐπειδὴν ὁ χορὸς συστὰς τὰς τοῦ δαίμονος τελετὰς ὀργιάζει, θαυμάσιον ἐπιτελεῖσθαί φασιν ἔργον· ἄμπελοι γὰρ, ἃς καλοῦσιν ἐφήμερους, ἀνισχούσης μὲν ἡμέρας καρπὸν βλα-

<sup>f</sup> Ver. 64 sqq.                      <sup>g</sup> Ver. 38.

<sup>h</sup> Ver. 107, 108 : 702, 703.

<sup>i</sup> 677 : 714 : 735 sqq.

<sup>k</sup> 748, 749.

<sup>m</sup> 660-662.

<sup>n</sup> 1092. cf. the Helene, 1360: Etym.

M. Γάλλος.

<sup>o</sup> Phœnissæ, 787 : cf. Schol. in loc. also ad 226-231.

<sup>p</sup> Pausanias, iii. xxii. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Soph. Antigone, 1130.

<sup>r</sup> Scholia in loc. cf. Ad Phœnissas, 226-229; Soph. Fragm. 239. e Thyeste.

<sup>s</sup> Scholia ad Iliad. N. 21.



στάνουσιν, ὥστε τραπέντας αὐτοὺς εἰς ἐσπέραν οἶνον ἄφθονον ἔχειν.  
ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Εὐφορίωνι †—

Στεφανηφόρου μετ' ἦρος  
μέλπομαι ῥόδον θερινὸν

.. .. .

τῷ σοφῷ τόδ' αὐτὸν τερπνόν,  
θαλίαις τε καὶ τραπέζαις,  
Διονυσίαις θ' ἑορταῖς †—

Ἐπί δ' ὄφρυσιν σελίνων  
στεφανίσκους θέμενοι νῦν  
θάλειαν ἑορτήν  
ἀγάγωμεν Διονύσῳ †.

\* Εξοχα δ' ἀμπέδιον Μαϊάνδριον, ἔνθα Καύστρου  
ἦσυχα καχλάζοντος ἐπιρρέει ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.  
οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ γυναικας ὀνόσσειαι, αἱ περὶ κείνο  
θεῖον ἔδος χρυσοῖο κατ' ἰξύος ἄμμα βαλοῦσαι  
ὄρχεῦνται, θηητὸν ἐλισσόμεναι περὶ κύκλον,  
εὔτε Διωνύσιοιο χοροστασίας τελείον.  
σὺν καὶ παρθενικαῖ, νεοθηλέες οἰά τε νεβροὶ,  
σκαίρουσιν· τῆσιν δὲ περὶ σμαραγεῦντες ἀῆται  
ἱμερτοὺς δονέουσιν ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνας †—

Aut quales referunt Baccho sollemnia nymphæ  
Mæoniæ, quas Hermus alit †.

Χείματος ἠνεμόντος ἀπ' αἰθέρος οἰχομένοιο  
πορφυρέη μείδησε φερανθέος ἔϊαρος ὦρη †  
.. .. .

οἱ δ' ἀπαλὴν πίνοντες ἀεξιφύτου δρόσον ἡοῦς  
λειμῶνες γελώωσιν, ἀνοιγομένοιο ῥόδοιο.  
χαίρει καὶ σύριγγι νομεὺς ἐν ὄρεσσι λιγαίωνων,  
καὶ πολιοῖς ἐρίφοις ἐπιτέρπεται αἰπόλος αἰγῶν.  
ἦδη δὲ πλώουσιν ἐπ' εὐρέα κύματα ναῦται  
πνοιῇ ἀπημάντῳ Ζεφύρου λῖνα κολπώσαντες.  
ἦδη δ' εὐάζουσι φερεσταφύλῳ Διονύσῳ,  
ἄνθεϊ † βοτρυόεντος ἐρεψάμενοι τρίχα κισσοῦ.

Οὐδέ τις ἦν ἀχόρευτος ἀνὰ πτόλι, ἀγρονόμων δὲ  
εἰαρινοῖς πετάλοισιν ἐμιτρώθησαν ἀγυιαί †.

† Ibid. cf. Eustathius, in loc. 917. 37.

† Anacreon, liii. *Eis ῥόδον*, i-18.

† Ibid. Frag. xvii. p. 348. cf. Athe-

næus, xv. 16.

† Dionysius Perieg. 837.

† Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinæ*, ii. 67.

† Anthologia, i. 32. Meleager, cχ. *De Vere*, i.

† Cf. vers. 21.

† Nonnus, xlv. 125. of the first Dio-

nysia at Thebes.

Μέλει δ' ἔμοι ὄργια Βακχῶν  
 ὑμετέρων, ὅτε γαῖα φυτῶν ὠδίνα πεπαίνει,  
 μαρμαρυγὴν δροσόεσσαν ἀκοιμήτοιο Σελήνης  
 δεχρυσμένη<sup>d</sup>—

Καὶ Καμαριτᾶων φῦλον μέγα, τοί ποτε Βάκχον  
 Ἰνδῶν ἐκ πολέμοιο δεδεγμένοι ἐξείνισσαν,  
 καὶ μετὰ Δηνάων ἱερὸν χορὸν ἐστήσαντο,  
 ζώματα καὶ νεβρίδας ἐπὶ στήθεσσι βαλόντες,  
 εὐοὶ Βάκχε λέγοντες, ὁ δὲ φρεσὶ φίλατο δαίμων  
 κείνων ἀνθρώπων γενεὴν καὶ ἦθεα γαίης<sup>e</sup>—

Exstimulat vatem per Dindyma castra Kybelles,  
 Perque Kithæronem Nyseaque per juga Bacchi,  
 Per sua Parnassi, per amica silentia Musis  
 Pierii nemoris, Bacchea voce frementem  
 Delie te Pæan, et te Euie Euie Pæan<sup>f</sup>.

"Εριφος· ὁ Διόνυσος. ἔριφος, ὁ μικρὸς αἰῖξ, ὁ ἐν τῷ ἔαρι φαινόμενος, ἤγουν ὁ πρῶτος· χίμαρος δὲ ὁ ἐν τῷ χειμῶνι<sup>g</sup>—Θιακχά· ἄνη ἐν Σικυῶνι<sup>h</sup>—' Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Ἰάκχαν τινὰ καλούμενον οἶδα στέφανον ὑπὸ Σικυωνίων, ὡς φησι Τιμαχίδας ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις<sup>i</sup>.

If these different testimonies are consistent with each other, the Dionysia in the sense of the *orgies* must have had an equal relation both to the winter and to the spring; i. e. their proper time must have been critically between the two,—the early spring—the first of the spring months, according to the division of the quarters made by the ancients; the month which in the Attic calendar was called Anthesterion, and in the Bœotian Hermæus. If then the Dionysia, in this sense of the orgies, had a stated season in the natural year, they had also a stated month in the civil calendar; which, in the old octaëteric calendar, must have been the second in general. But as this is a point of importance, it is desirable to confirm it by some further proofs; in order to prepare the way for the discovery of the rule of the orgies in this respect from the first.

SECTION III.—iii. *Seat of the Dionysia, in the sense of the Orgies, in the old Octaëteric Calendar.*

i. The Dionysia among the Athenians were associated with the mysteries: Ὦν τῆς τελετῆς οὐ μόνον χορευτῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔξ-

<sup>d</sup> xliv. 219. ubi Luna loquitur.

<sup>e</sup> Dionys. Perieg. 700.

<sup>f</sup> Columella, De Hort. Cultura, 220.

Lib. x.

<sup>g</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. cf. in Ἰάκχα.

<sup>i</sup> Athenæus, xv. 22.

αρχος ἦν ὁ Διόνυσος. καὶ μὲν δὴ Διονύσου ἐν Ἐλευσίνι ἱερόν ἐστι, καὶ ἐν Διονυσίοις ἐτελείτο τὰ μυστήρια<sup>k</sup>—Ἐν τοῖς Ἀθηναϊκοῖς ἀγῶσι τοῦ Διονύσου ὁ δαδούχος κατέχων λαμπάδα λέγει, καλεῖτε θεόν. καὶ οἱ ὑπακούοντες βοῶσι, Σεμελίμει, Ἰακχε, Πλουτοδότα<sup>l</sup>. Now we read nowhere of any Dionysia at the greater mysteries. It must therefore have been with the lesser<sup>m</sup>. And this conjunction of the Dionysia with the mysteries must have been ultimately due to the coincidence between the stated time of the Dionysia and that of the lesser mysteries; consequently in Anthesterion.

ii. The suppositions in the Thebais of Statius, which we considered at large in illustration of the Bœotian calendar<sup>n</sup>, were no doubt founded on the rule of the Dionysia at Thebes, as still kept up even in his time, or at least as known to have been formerly observed; and according to these they were in course both at the opening of the action of the poem, in the first year, and again, at the same time, in the third year; and that time in each instance the beginning of the early spring, the Flatus Favonii, the second month in the Bœotian calendar. It is no objection that on the second occasion, and after the celebration of his orgies among the Thracians, Dionysos was returning to Thebes just before the institution of the Nemean games; a much later period in the natural year, as we may probably see hereafter. It is not said how long before his orgies had been celebrated in Thrace; only that they were over at the time of this return: but whether one month, or two months, or even three months before, is not specified, and we are at liberty to suppose, just as the necessity of the case may require.

iii. In Ovid's account of the death of Orpheus, which both he, and all the poets, agreeably to the common tradition, date at the time of the orgies; the third year since the death of Eurydike is described as follows:

Tertius æquoreis inclusum Piscibus annum  
Finierat Titan; omnemque refugerat Orpheus  
Femineam Venerem<sup>o</sup>—

And this supposes the proper termination of the natural year

<sup>k</sup> Scholia in Ranas, 346.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. ver. 482.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. supra, Vol. iv. page 315, note.

<sup>n</sup> Part i. Vol. ii. 336 sqq.

<sup>o</sup> Metam. x. 78. cf. 1-77.

to have been the sign of Pisces; the last before the vernal equinox. And now the orgies, followed by the death of Orpheus, are in course; and the labours of husbandry going on at the same time, the Bacchanals take advantage of that coincidence to wreak their vengeance on Orpheus, with the instruments of agriculture—

Neu desint tela furori—

Forte boves presso subigebant vomere terram;  
Nec procul hinc, multo fructus sudore parantes,  
Dura lacertosi fodiebant arva coloni<sup>p</sup>.

To understand this of seed-time, properly so called, would be contradictory to the context. But such operations as these of ploughing and digging were characteristic of the early spring too; and there was a spring seed-time as well as an autumnal one<sup>q</sup>—

Vere novo, gelidus canis quum montibus humor  
Liquitur, et Zephyro putris se gleba resolvit,  
Depresso incipiat jam tum mihi taurus aratro  
Ingemere, et sulco adtritrus splendescere vomer<sup>r</sup>.

Pingue solum primis extemplo a mensibus anni  
Fortes invertant tauri, glebasque jacentes  
Pulverulenta coquat maturis solibus æstas<sup>s</sup>.

The death of Orpheus then is clearly laid by Ovid in the first month of the natural year; and consequently the Dionysia too. If we compare Virgil's account of the same event, though differing from his in its circumstances, it will be found to lead to the same conclusion, about the time of the year at which the catastrophe happened at last—

Septem illum totos perhibent ex ordine menses  
Rupe sub aëria deserti ad Strymonis undam  
Flevisse, et gelidis hæc evoluisse sub antris  
Mulcentem tigres et agentem carmine quercus<sup>t</sup>.

Nulla Venus, non ulli animum flexere hymenæi.  
Solut Hyperboreas glacies Tanaimque nivalem  
Arvaque Riphæis nunquam viduata pruinis  
Lustrabat, raptam Eurydicen atque inrita Ditis  
Dona querens. spretæ Ciconum quo munere matres  
Inter sacra deum nocturnique orgia Bacchi  
Discerptum latos juvenem sparsere per agros<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. xi. 30. cf. 1-66.

<sup>q</sup> Cf. our *Origines Kalendaræ Italicæ*, ii. 41, note: also supra, Vol. iv. page 315, note.

<sup>r</sup> *Georgica*, i. 43.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. iv. 507.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. iv. 516.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 64.

Now the death of Orpheus, which thus ensued at the end of these seven months, was speedily followed by his vengeance, and that of the Nymphs, which took effect on the bees of Aristæus—

Pastor Aristæus fugiens Peneïa Tempe,  
Amissis, ut fama, apibus morboque fameque<sup>y</sup>—

Non te nullius exercent numinis iræ;  
Magna luis commissa: tibi has miserabilis Orpheus  
Haudquaquam ob meritum pœnas, ni fata resistant,  
Suscitat, et rapta graviter pro conjuge sævit<sup>z</sup>.

Nate, licet tristes animo deponere curas.  
Hæc omnis morbi causa; hinc miserabile Nymphæ,  
Cum quibus illa choros lucis agitabat in altis,  
Exitium misere apibus<sup>a</sup>.

The destruction of his bees then must be supposed to have coincided with the close of the seven months also; in which case, these seven months must have expired at or about the time when, under ordinary circumstances, bees were expected to revive after the winter, and to take to their usual employments in the fields. What this time was for the climate of Greece, we may learn from Aristotle, speaking of the habits of the bee: 'Ἡσυχάζει δ' ἀπὸ Πλειιάδος οὐσεως μέχρι τοῦ ἔαρος<sup>b</sup> —'Εν δὲ τοῖς εὐθηνούσι τῶν σμηνῶν ἐκλείπει ὁ γόνος τῶν μελιττῶν περὶ τετταράκονθ' ἡμέρας μόνον, τὰς μετὰ χειμερινὰς τροπὰς<sup>c</sup> — Πεινώσι δὲ μάλισθ' ἡρὶκ' ἀν' ἀρχονται ἐκ τοῦ χειμῶνος<sup>d</sup>—'Εὰν δὲ ἔαρ ὄψιον γένηται ἢ αὐχμὸς, καὶ ὅταν ἐρυσίβη, ἐλαττον ἐργάζονται αἱ μέλιται τὸν γόνον<sup>e</sup>—De Vespis: Τοῦ γὰρ χειμῶνος ἀρχομένου μωροὶ γίνονται οἱ ἐργάται αὐτῶν· περὶ τροπὰς δ' οὐ φαίνονται ὄλως<sup>f</sup>—Pliny gives a similar account of the bee in Italy: Conduntur a Vergiliarum occasu, sed latent ultra exortum ... ante fabas florentes exeunt ad opera et labores<sup>g</sup>—A bruma ad Arcturi exortum (Dec. 25 to Feb. 23) diebus lx somno aluntur, sine ullo cibo. ab Arcturi exortu ad æquinoctium vernum tepidiore tractu jam vigilant; sed etiam tunc alveo se continent, servatosque in id tempus cibos repetunt. in Italia vero hoc idem a Vergiliarum exortu faciunt: in eum

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. iv. 317.<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 453.<sup>a</sup> Ibid. 531.<sup>b</sup> De Animalibus, viii. 13. 234. 6.<sup>c</sup> Ibid. ix. 40. 290. 13.<sup>d</sup> Ibid. 293. 23.<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 294. 15.<sup>f</sup> ix. 41. 295. 2.<sup>g</sup> H. N. xi. 5. p. 230.

dormiunt<sup>h</sup>—De Melle: Venit hoc ex aëre, et maxime siderum exortu, præcipueque ipso Sirio exsplendescente fit, nec omnino prius Vergiliarum exortu<sup>i</sup>. So likewise Columella: Ex Hygino<sup>k</sup>, a commentator on the *Georgica* of Virgil<sup>l</sup>: Ab occasu Vergiliarum ad brumam ... jam recondito melle utuntur examina<sup>m</sup>—Post confectam brumam diebus fere quadraginta quidquid est repositi mellis ..... consumunt, et sæpe etiam vacuatis ceris usque in ortum Arcturi, qui est ab Idibus Februarii, jejunæ favis accubantes torpent more serpentum<sup>n</sup>—Ab æquinoctio primo, quod mense Martio circa viii kal. Aprilis in octava parte Arictis conficitur, ad exortum Vergiliarum dies verni temporis habentur duodequingenta (March 25—May 11): per hos ..... apes curandas esse, adapertis alveis<sup>o</sup>—Ab æquinoctio verno siue cunctatione jam passim vagantur<sup>p</sup>—Duodequingagesimo die ab æquinoctio verno, cum fit Vergiliarum exortus, circa v Idus Maias, incipiunt examina viribus et numero augeri<sup>q</sup>. Lastly, Virgil himself—

Quod superest, ubi pulsam hiemen sol aureus egit  
Sub terras, cælumque æstiva luce reclusit,  
Illæ continuo saltus silvasque peragrant,  
Purpureosque metunt flores<sup>r</sup>.

Bis gravidos cogunt fœtus; duo tempora messis—  
Taygete simul os terris ostendit honestum  
Plias, et Oceani spretos pede reppulit amnes,  
Aut eadem sidus fugiens ubi Piscis aquosi  
Tristior hibernas cœlo descendit in undas<sup>s</sup>.

The time then, at which bees in the common course of nature should have begun to bestir themselves and to have repaired to the fields afresh, must have been soon after the Orgies. The vengeance therefore of Orpheus and of the Nymphs must have made itself felt just at this time. And though the discovery of the cause of the visitation is protracted until midsummer—

Jam rapidus torrens sitientes Sirius Indos<sup>t</sup>—

<sup>h</sup> H. N. xi. 15. 262.

<sup>i</sup> xi. 12.

<sup>k</sup> De Re Rustica, ix. 14. § 1. 18.

<sup>l</sup> i. 1. § 13. p. 394.

<sup>m</sup> ix. 14. § 12.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. § 17.

<sup>o</sup> § 1.

<sup>p</sup> § 18.

<sup>q</sup> § 4.

<sup>r</sup> *Georgica*, iv. 51.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 231.

<sup>t</sup> iv. 425.

that is merely *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*. The directions given to Aristæus at last, for the reproduction of his bees, are such in themselves, and as so described, as were proper only for the early spring—

Hoc geritur, Zephyris primum inpellentibus undas,  
Ante novis rubeant quam prata coloribus, ante  
Garrula quam tignis nidum suspendat hirundo v—

though, from the special reasons of the case, they were both enjoined and executed in this first instance at midsummer\*.

iv. It appears from the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus x that the extermination of the male population of Lemnus by the women coincided with the time of the Orgies. Thoas was concealed by Hypsipyle in the temple of Dionysos, and under the vest of the god itself, while this massacre of the rest was going on. The time of the year was still the winter; as may be collected from the description of the vessel in which Thoas is soon after sent away—

Visa ratis, sævæ defecta laboribus undæ,  
Quam Thetidi longinqua dies Glaucoque repostam  
Solibus, et canis urgebat luna pruinis v.

It follows that the sea must now have been open; and therefore that the time of the Orgies and that of the *Mare apertum*, in the sense of the earliest epoch of that kind,

\* This traditionary account of the time of the year, at which the death of Orpheus was supposed to have happened, is illustrated by another tradition, relating to the constellation *Lyra*: which being supposed to have been the Lyre of Orpheus translated to the heavens, and asterised, was supposed also to set (that is, disappear from view) every year, at the same season and time of the year, at which he had been put to death. Eratosthenes observes of this constellation<sup>1</sup>: Ἐπισημασίαν δ' ἔχει ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκείνου συμπτώματι, δομένη καθ' ὥραν. Now in all the *Parapegmata* of antiquity which have come down to us, the date assigned to the *Lyra occasus* is some time towards the end of January, or the beginning of February. in Ptolemy, for the parallel of 15 hours, Mecheir 5 and 13, Jan. 30 and Febr. 7; in Ovid, Jan. 23—February 2; in Columella, January 22—February 1; in Pliny, February 4. Such then must have been the traditionary season of the death of Orpheus.

<sup>1</sup> Καταστερισμοὶ 24. Opuscula Mythologica: cf. Manilius, Astron. i. 331-334; Hyginus, Poetic. Astron. ii. vii. *Lyra*. Some of the ancients in-

deed explain this constellation of the Lyre of Arion: Hyginus, Fabb. cxciv: Servius ad *Ecolg.* viii. 55.

v iv. 305. . . x ii. 254-276.

v ii. 285. cf. 285-305.

(which Hesiod<sup>z</sup> dated with the first beginning of spring,) must have coincided. This coincidence may be inferred also from what Philostratus relates of a custom, still kept up at Lemnus, as a memorial of this Lemnian massacre<sup>a</sup> :

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἔργῳ, τῷ περὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λήμνῳ γυναικῶν ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης ποτὲ πραχθέντι, καθαίρεται μὲν ἡ Λήμνος καθ' ἓνα (μῆνα) τοῦ ἔτους, καὶ σβέννυται τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ πῦρ ἡμέρας ἐννέα. θεωρὶς δὲ ναῦς ἐκ Δήλου πυρφορεῖ· κὰν ἀφίκηται πρὸ τῶν ἐναγισμάτων, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς Λήμνου καθορμίζεται· μετέωρος δὲ ἐπισαλεύει τοῖς ἀκρωτηρίοις ἔς τ' ἂν αἴσιον τὸ πλεῦσαι γένηται. θεοὺς γὰρ χθονίους καὶ ἀπορρήτους καλοῦντες τότε, καθαρὸν οἶμαι τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ φυλάττουσιν. ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ θεωρὶς ἐσπλεύσῃ, καὶ νεύμονται τὸ πῦρ ἔς τε τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν ἔς τε τὰς ἐμπύρους τῶν τεχνῶν, καινοῦ τὸ ἐντεῦθεν βίου φασὶν ἄρχεσθαι.

v. It appears from Arrian<sup>b</sup> that there was a yearly sacrifice to Dionysos in the Macedonian calendar; the omission of which by Alexander on the occasion in question was supposed to have moved the anger of the god, and to have been ultimately the cause of the death of Clitus: Εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ἡμέραν ἱερὰν τοῦ Διονύσου Μακεδόσι, καὶ θύειν Διονύσῳ ὅσα ἔτη ἐν αὐτῇ Ἀλέξανδρον. τὸν δὲ τοῦ Διονύσου ἐν τῷ τότε ἀμελήσαι λέγουσι, Διοσκούροιον δὲ θῦσαι, ἐξότου δὲ ἐπιφρασθέντα τοῖν Διοσκούροιον, τὴν θυσίαν<sup>c</sup>. Alexander at this time was at Zariaspa<sup>d</sup>, and the season was the ἀκμαῖον τοῦ χειμῶνος<sup>e</sup>. The proper time then of this stated sacrifice to Dionysos must have been the ἀκμή of winter: which at that time, Cycle xviii. 4 of the old Macedonian calendar, would have applied exactly to the site of the second month, Jan. 15—Feb. 13, B. C. 328. Only two or three days also before the death of Clitus Alexander received a present of what Plutarch calls the ὀπώρα Ἑλληνικῇ<sup>f</sup>, (i. e. the summer fruits of the climate of Greece,) sent up to him from the seacoast: and this could scarcely have reached him where he was in less than six or seven months.

vi. The stated season of the Orgies may be inferred also from a passage of Galen, which gives an account of a prescription for the composition of the Theriaca; the author of

<sup>z</sup> Opp. et Dies, 676-684.

<sup>b</sup> iv. 8.

<sup>d</sup> Arrian, iv. 7.

<sup>a</sup> Heroica. 716. C. Neoptolemus.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Part i. vol. iii. 135.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Alexander, l.



which was Andromachus, the ἀρχίατρος of Nero, and in which one of the ingredients was the flesh of vipers or of other serpents—

Πρῶτα μὲν ἀγρεύσαιο κακήθεας ἐμπέραμος φῶς  
 τολμηρῇ μάρπτων χειρὶ θοοὺς ὄφιας.  
 τοὺς ἤδη κρυεροῦ ἀπὸ χεΐματος οὐκέτι γαίης  
 κρύπτουσι στεινοὶ πάμπαν ἔνερθε μυχοί,  
 εἰαρηνὴν δ' ἐφ' ἄλῳα χυτὸν βόσκονται ἂν ἄλσος,  
 διζόμενοι χλωροῦ σπέρμα λαβεῖν μαράθρου \* ε.

The time when the snake reappeared after the winter, and when it sloughed its skin, according to the ancients, were the same; and that of both, the beginning of spring: Καὶ μάλιστα πάντων οἱ ὄφεις· ἐκδύνουσι γὰρ καὶ τοῦ ἔαρος ὅταν ἐξίωσι, καὶ τοῦ μετοπώρου πάλιν. ἐκδύνουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ ἔχεις τὸ γήρας καὶ τοῦ ἔαρος καὶ τοῦ μετοπώρου<sup>h</sup>—“Ὅταν ἀποδύσῃται τὸ γήρας ὁ ὄφεις, ὑπαρχομένον δὲ τοῦ ἡρος δρᾶ τοῦτο, ... ἀμβλυώττει δὲ ἄρα διὰ τοῦ χειμῶνος, φωλεύσας ἐν μυχῶ καὶ σκότῳ<sup>i</sup>—Ut solent verno tempore foveis exsilire serpentes<sup>k</sup>—

Ceu lubricus alta

Anguis humo verni blanda ad spiramina solis  
 Erigitur, liber senio, et squallentibus annis  
 Exutus, lætisque minax interviret herbis<sup>l</sup>.

These descriptions would suit the early spring, the Zephyri flatus, the season of the revival of vegetable nature in general. Let us compare then the directions of Andromachus with Galen's commentary upon them<sup>m</sup>: Κάλλιστος οὖν ἐστὶ καιρὸς (for using the viper) ὁ μεταξὺ τούτων (the torpid season and midsummer), ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀνδρόμαχος ἐδήλωσεν, ἡνίκα καὶ οἱ τῶ Διονύσῳ βακχεύοντες εἰώθασιν διασπᾶν τὰς ἐχίδνας, πανομένον μὲν τοῦ ἡρος οὐπω δ' ἡργμένον θέροις, ἢ, εἰ χειμέριον ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ ἔαρ γίγνοιτο, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ θέρους, οὐ κατὰ (μετὰ) πολὺ τῆς τῶν Πλειάδων ἐπιτολῆς. We may infer then from these observations, that the flesh of the viper was in the greatest perfection between the close of the torpid season, (the end of winter, or the beginning of the early spring,)

\* Cf. Lactantius, ad Theb. iv. 97: Herba quædam dicitur Marathros, quam cum comederint (serpentes) senium deponunt ætatis.

ε Opp. xiv. 37. Περὶ ἀντιδότων, i. 6.

h Aristotle, De Animalibus, viii. 17.

237, 4.

i Ælian, De Natura Anim. ix. 16.

k Ammianus Marc. xix. 13.

l Statius, Thebais, iv. 95.

m Libro citato, cap. 8. p. 45.

and the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή: and this being the time when those who were celebrating the Orgies were accustomed to tear them in pieces \*, the same in general must have been the usual season of the Orgies, Πανομένου μὲν τοῦ ἡρος οὐπω δ' ἡργμένου θέρους.

SECTION IV.—*On the Dionysia in the sense of the Scenic representations of classical antiquity.*

As the Dionysia, in the sense of the Orgies, were much older than the Dionysia in this sense of the dramatic representations of antiquity, and as the latter were not necessarily connected with the former, there would be every reason *a priori* to suppose that the rule of the former, with respect to times and seasons, must have determined that of the latter; and if the cycle of the Orgies was a period of two years, that of these exhibitions would be one of two years also; if the stated season of the former was the end of winter, or beginning of spring, that of the latter would be the same.

Now with this latter expectation in particular, the state of the case, as far as we have been able to discover, appears to have been entirely in accordance. The Dionysia, in the sense of the dramatic exhibitions and contests of classical antiquity, seem to have been everywhere attached to the same season of the natural year, the end of winter, and the beginning of spring. It may be confidently assumed at least, that this was the case with those of the Athenians; the rule of which happens to be better ascertained than that of any others among the Greeks. But with regard to the cycle of such exhibitions, the dramatic representations of the Athenians, of later times at least, were annual: and yet it may be doubted whether they were always so. A scholium occurs in Demosthenes *Contra Midiam* <sup>u</sup>, which, though mistaken of the time to which it is there referred, might have

\* Cf. Prudentius, *Contra Symm.* i. 129:

His nunc pro meritis Baccho caper omnibus aris  
Cæditur, et virides discindunt ore chelydros,  
Qui Bromium placare volunt.

<sup>u</sup> xxi. Argum. ii.

been true of some former time: "Ἦγετο δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν τὰ Διονύσια, καὶ ταῦτα διπλᾶ, μικρὰ τε καὶ μεγάλα· καὶ τὰ μὲν μικρὰ ἦγετο κατ' ἔτος, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα διὰ τριετηρίδος ἐν τοῖς ληνοῖς. It is certain however that elsewhere, if not at Athens, these exhibitions were *trieteric* in some instances, as much as the Orgies. For instance, at Rhodes; as appears from extant inscriptions<sup>o</sup>: 'Ἐν τῇ τῶν Βακχείων ὑποδοχῇ κατὰ τριετηρίδα—'Αιρέθηκε τριετηρίσι καὶ τῷ κοινῷ. Also in Bithynia, and at Pergamus: Τριετηρίδες<sup>p</sup>. 'Ἡμέραι παρὰ Βιθυνοῖς ἐν αἷς ἀφ' ἡμέρας ποτοὶ συνεχεῖς ἐγίνοντο· καὶ παρὰ τὰς συνουσίας πᾶν γένος ἀκροαμάτων εἰσῆγετο· καὶ καθόλου πολλήν τινα ῥαθυμίαν εἶχε τὸ Πέργαμοι.

In treating however of the Dionysia in this more limited sense, the necessity of the case restricts us to those of the Athenians, of the rule of which we possess abundant means of judging even at present; whereas with respect to any others, and elsewhere, we are almost destitute of information—though the little which *is* known concerning them, leads to the inference that they did not materially differ from the Athenian, especially as to the season of the year: and that everywhere else, as well as among the Athenians, their rule was ultimately to be traced to that of the Orgies.

SECTION V.—*On the Scenic Dionysia of the Athenians in particular.* i. *Number and names of the Dionysia in this sense, at Athens.*

With respect to the number of the Dionysia in this sense, and their several denominations, among the Athenians, it appears there were three such representations, to which they gave the names of the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις, the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει, and the Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς, or ἐν Πειραιεῖ, respectively: and all three are mentioned together in the law quoted by Demosthenes *Contra Midiam* <sup>q</sup>.

i. The Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς, or ἐν Πειραιεῖ. 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς Διονύσια εἰς ἀγρὸν ἦγεν ἀεὶ ἡμᾶς<sup>r</sup>—"Ὡστε πρώην ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἀγροῦς Διονυσίοις κωμῶδῶν ὄντων ἐν Κολυττῷ<sup>s</sup>—"Ὅταμ ποιῶσι Πειραιεῖς

<sup>o</sup> Corpus Inscript. 2525 b. ii. 392 d.

<sup>p</sup> Suidas, in voce.

<sup>q</sup> xxi. 15.

<sup>r</sup> Isæus, viii. 21.

<sup>s</sup> Æschines, i. 157. *Contra Timarchum*: cf. 41. 49: Epp. v. 20.

τὰ Διονύσια<sup>t</sup>. And this title of the Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς is applied even to the Λήναια<sup>v</sup>.

ii. The Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις. Λίμναι (δὲ) χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἐν ᾧ Διονύσου ἱερόν... Καλλιμαχος, ἐν Ἐκάλῃ—

Λιμναίῳ δὲ χοροστάδας ἦγον ἑορτάς<sup>x</sup>—

Λίμναι γ. καὶ ἕτερος τόπος τῆς Ἀττικῆς, Λίμναι καλούμενος, ἔνθα ὁ Διόνυσος ἐτιμᾶτο, καὶ οἱ Λιμναῖοι—

χοροστάδας ἦγον ἑορτάς—

Δέσποιν' ἀλίαις Ἄρτεμι Λίμνας<sup>z</sup>—

Τὸν ἀμφὶ Λίμνας τρόχον<sup>a</sup>.

Ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσιον<sup>b</sup>. Ἰσαῖος, περὶ τοῦ Κίρωνος κληροῦ. τόπος ἐστὶν ἐν Ἀθήναις Λίμναι, ἐν ᾧ ὁ τιμώμενος Διόνυσος<sup>c</sup>— Τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσιον<sup>d</sup>—Λιμναγενές. Λίμναι ἐν Ἀθήναις τόπος ἀνειμένος Διονύσῳ, ὅπου τὰ Λήναια ἦγετο<sup>e</sup>—Λίμναι γοῦν, φασι, τόπος ἐν Ἀττικῇ, καὶ Λιμναῖος ἐκέλευεν Διόνυσος<sup>f</sup>—Λίμναι τόπος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῶν Ἀθηνῶν<sup>g</sup>—Ἐαυτῶν τέμενος λέγουσι τὸ ἐν Λίμναις τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερόν· πρὸς δὲ τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν, ὅτι ἐν Λίμναις εἰσὶν οἱ βάτραχοι, Λίμναι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερόν<sup>h</sup>—

Ἦν ἀμφὶ Νυσηῖον

Διὸς Διόνυσον ἐν

Λίμναισιν ἰαχίσταμεν<sup>i</sup>—

Λήναιον· ἱερόν Διονύσου ἐφ' οὗ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐτίθεισαν πρὸ τοῦ τοῦ θέατρον ἀνοικοδομηθῆναι<sup>k</sup>—Ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ<sup>l</sup>. ἀγὼν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἄστει, Λήναιον, περίβολον ἔχων μέγα. καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ Ληναίου Διονύσου ἱερόν, ἐν ᾧ ἐπετελοῦντο οἱ ἀγῶνες τῶν Ἀθηναίων, πρὶν τὸ θέατρον οἰκοδομηθῆναι<sup>m</sup>—Ἐορτὴ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὰ Λήναια, (ἐστὶ

<sup>t</sup> Corpus Inscript. 101 : i. 139.

<sup>v</sup> As by Aristophanes, Acharn. 202. cf. 250, and compare 961. 1000. 1076. 1086. 1211. 1155. 544, which shew that the Λήναια were really meant: cf. also Steph. Byz. Λήναιος... ἀγῶν Διονύσου ἐν ἀγροῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ληνοῦ.

<sup>x</sup> Scholia in Ranas, 218.

<sup>y</sup> Steph. Byz.

<sup>z</sup> Hippolytus, 228.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. 1132.

<sup>b</sup> Harpocration.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Suidas, in voce.

<sup>d</sup> Isæus, viii. 48.

<sup>e</sup> Hesychius. cf. in Λιμνομάχαι.

<sup>f</sup> Eustathius, ad Pliad. Λ. 641. 871.

<sup>g</sup> Scholia in Thucyd. ii. 15. cf. Athenæus, iv. 5 : xi. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Scholia ad Ranas, 221.

<sup>i</sup> Ranæ, 215. There was a Λίμναι at Sparta also, and a temple of Dionysos there too: Strabo, viii. 5. 185. ad calc.: Τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν ἐλίμναζε τὸ προάστειον, καὶ ἐκάλουον αὐτὸ Λίμνας. καὶ τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερόν ἐν Λίμναις ἐφ' ὕψους βεβηκὸς ἐτύγχανε· νῦν δ' ἐπὶ ξηροῦ τὴν ἴδρυσιν ἔχει.

<sup>k</sup> Anecdota, 278. 8.

<sup>l</sup> Hesychius. cf. Acharn. 504.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. in ἱερῖα: Photii Lex. Ληναίων: Suidas, Ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ: Etym. M. Ἐπιληναίῳ.

δὲ εἰς Διόνυσον)· ἐν ἣ μέχρι νῦν ἀγωνίζονται ποιηταὶ, συγγράφων-  
 τές τινα ἄσματα τοῦ γελασθῆναι χάριν<sup>n</sup>—Τὰ Λήναια λεγόμενα.  
 ἔθθεν τὰ Λήναια καὶ ὁ ἐπιλήναιος ἀγὼν τελεῖται τῷ Διονύσῳ<sup>o</sup>—  
 Λήναιον γάρ ἐστιν ἐν ἀγροῖς ἱερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου<sup>p</sup>.

These Dionysia ἐν Λίμναις, or ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ, were called Ἄν-  
 θεστήρια also; as we shall see by and by.

iii. The Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει. They are generally alluded to  
 under the name of the Διονύσια absolutely, or that of the  
 Διονύσια μεγάλα: Ἐκ Διονυσίων εὐθὺς τῶν ἀστικῶν<sup>q</sup>.

SECTION V. ii.—*Season of the year of these different kinds of  
 the Scenic Dionysia at Athens respectively.*

With regard to the time of the year at which these Dio-  
 nysia appear to have been respectively celebrated; the Διονύ-  
 σια ἐν ἀγροῖς in particular are seen to have fallen out much  
 more decidedly in the winter than either of the other two;  
 the reason of which we hope to explain by and by. With  
 respect to the other two, the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις and the Διο-  
 νύσια ἐν ἄστει, the rule of the Dionysia in the sense of the  
 Orgies, as regarded their proper time and season, was strictly  
 applicable to each of them. The proper season of each of  
 these also appears to have been the end of the winter or the  
 beginning of spring.

In the Anecdota Græca Parisiensia of the late Dr. Cramer,  
 there is a long extract Περὶ Κωμωδίας, in which the κατα-  
 σκευὴ or furniture of the ancient stage is circumstantially  
 described; and it begins<sup>r</sup>, Ἐν ἔαρινῷ καιρῷ πολυτελέσι δαπά-  
 ναις κατασκευάζετο ἡ σκηνὴ κ', τ. λ. Aristophanes speaks of the  
 Dionysia absolutely as later than the Hirundinis adventus<sup>s</sup>—  
 Τὰ δὲ Ἀθηναίων τί χρὴ λέγειν; πάντα μεστὰ ἑορτῆς τὰ Ἀττικά,  
 πάντα θυμηδίας. καὶ διέλαχον αὐτοῖς ὦραι τὰς ἡδοῖας, ἦρος Διο-  
 νύσια, μετοπώρου μυστήρια<sup>t</sup>—Ζητεῖται δὲ πῶς μεγάλας τὰς νύκτας  
 λέγει. Διονυσιακοῦ γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ δράματος, συνεστάθαι τὰς  
 νύκτας ἀνάγκη διὰ τὸ τοιούτῳ καιρῷ ὑποπίπτειν τὰ Διονύσια<sup>v</sup>—

<sup>n</sup> Scholia in Equites, 544.

<sup>o</sup> Scholia in Acharn. 201.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. cf. Suidas, Ληναϊτής: Λή-  
 ναια: Ληναῖος.

<sup>q</sup> Thucyd. v. 20. cf. Æschin. Contra  
 Tim. 43. Hesychius, Διονύσια: Xeno-  
 phon, De Officio Mag. Equit. iii. 2:  
 Athenæus, xi. 13: Ælian, De Natura

Anim. iv. 43, &c.

<sup>r</sup> i. 9. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Pax, 797-800. cf. Acharn. 136 sqq.  
 9-12.

<sup>t</sup> Maximus Tyrius, iii. 10. 29. cf. iii.  
 7. 25: vi. 8. 59.

<sup>v</sup> Scholia ad Nubes, 3.

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι λήγοντος μὲν τοῦ χειμῶνος ἀρχομένου δὲ ἔαρος ἄγεται τὰ Διονύσια<sup>x</sup>—Ἡ γὰρ ἀρχὴ τῶν Διονυσίων χειμῶνος ἄγεται<sup>y</sup>—Ἡρί τ' ἐπερχομένῳ Βρομίῳ χάρις'...τουτέστι τὰ Διονύσια· ἀρχομένου γὰρ τοῦ ἡρος ἄρχεται καὶ ἡ πανήγυρις<sup>z</sup>—Ἡρινοῖς<sup>a</sup>... ὅτι τῷ ἔαρι ἐν ἄστει τελοῦσι τὰ Διονύσια—Τὸν κατὰ καιρὸν φαινόμενον Διόνυσον<sup>b</sup>. ἐπεὶ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἔαρος τὰς ἐορτὰς αὐτοῦ ἦγον, καὶ τὰ κωμικὰ δρᾶματα ἐν ταύταις εἰσήγετο.

Moreover the Dionysia at Athens being distinguishable into the two principal kinds, the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις or ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ, and the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει, or the Διονύσια absolutely; the proper time of each in comparison of that of the other, though the same in general, was discriminated by *this* peculiarity, that at that of the former the sea was not yet considered to be open after the winter, at that of the latter it was—Καὶ τὴν θάλατταν ἐκ Διονυσίων πλώϊμον εἶναι<sup>c</sup>, i. e. the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει. By reason of this distinction strangers from abroad were not usually present at the former, but they might be so at the latter; and it was one of the fiscal regulations of the Athenians, that the annual tribute from their subjects or dependencies beyond seas should be brought at the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει.

Οὐ γὰρ με νῦν γε διαβαλεῖ Κλέων ὅτι  
ξένων παρόντων τὴν πόλιν κακῶς λέγω.  
αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐσμεν οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἀγῶν,  
κοῦπω ξένοι πάρισιν· οὔτε γὰρ φόροι  
ἦκουσιν οὔτ' ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι<sup>d</sup>.

Εἶπε γὰρ δρᾶμα, observes the Scholiast, τοὺς Βαβυλωνίους, τῇ τῶν Διονυσίων ἐορτῇ, ἣτις ἐν τῷ ἔαρι ἐπιτελεῖται, ἐν ᾧ ἔφερον τοὺς φόρους οἱ ξύμμαχοι...τὰ δὲ Λήναια ἐν τῷ μετοπώρῳ ἦγετο, ἐν οἷς οὐ παρήσαν οἱ ξένοι, ὅτε τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦτο οἱ Ἀχαρνεῖς ἐδιδάσκετο<sup>e</sup>—Χειμῶνος γὰρ λοιπὸν ὄντος εἰς τὰ Λήναια καθῆκε τὸ δρᾶμα. εἰς δὲ τὰ Διονύσια ἐτέτακτο Ἀθήναζε κομίζεω τὰς πόλεις τοὺς φόρους, ὡς Εὐπολὶς φησιν ἐν Πόλεσιν<sup>f</sup>—Ὁ τῶν Διονυσίων ἀγῶν ἐτελεῖτο δις τοῦ ἔτους, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔαρος ἐν ἄστει, ὅτε καὶ οἱ φόροι Ἀθήνησιν ἐφέροντο· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐν ἀγροῖς, ὃ ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ λεγόμενος, ὅτε ξένοι οὐ παρήσαν Ἀθήνησι· χειμῶν γὰρ λοιπὸν ἦν<sup>g</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Scholia ad Nubes, 10.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. 267. <sup>z</sup> Ibid. 310.

<sup>a</sup> Schol. ad Aves, 684.

<sup>b</sup> Ad Ranas, 398.

<sup>c</sup> Theophrastus, Ἀδολεσχία.

<sup>d</sup> Aristophanes, Acharnenses, 502.

<sup>e</sup> Schol. ad 377.

<sup>f</sup> Ad vers. 503.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. cf. ad 972. 1089.

SECTION V. iii.—*Calendar-dates of these different kinds of Scenic Dionysia at Athens respectively.*

With regard to the dates of these different kinds of Dionysia, i. Καὶ ὡς Βοηδρομιῶνος μὲν ἔστι τὰ μυστήρια, Πυανεισιῶνος δὲ Ἀπατούρια, Ποσειδεῶνος δὲ τὰ κατ' ἄγρους Διοιύσια<sup>h</sup>—Διοιύσια<sup>i</sup>· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήγησι ἢ Διοιύσῳ ἦγετο, τὰ μὲν κατ' ἄγρους μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος· τὰ δὲ κλαῖα (Λήγαια) μηνὸς Ληραιῶνος· τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄστει Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος—Διοιύσια· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήγησι Διοιύσου. ἦγετο δὲ τὰ μὲν κατ' ἄγρους μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος, τὰ δὲ Λήγαια Γαμηλιῶνος, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄστει Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος<sup>k</sup>—Διοιύσια ἑορτὴ Ἀθήγησι Διοιύσῳ ἦγετο· τὰ μὲν κατ' ἄγρους μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος, τὰ δὲ Λήγαια μηνὸς Μαιμακτηριῶνος, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄστει Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος<sup>l</sup>—Διοιύσια ἑορτὴ Ἀθήγησι Διοιύσῳ ἦγετο· τὰ μὲν κατ' ἄγρους μηνὸς Ποσειδεῶνος, τὰ δὲ Λήγαια μηνὸς Ληραιῶνος, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἄστει μηνὸς Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος<sup>m</sup>—Οὐ νεοτελής, ἀλλὰ μῆρες ἑπτὰ σχεδὸν ἀπὸ Διουνσίων, ὅτε πρῶτον εἶδον αὐτόν... καὶ μὴν ἐπόμνυται δύο καὶ εἴκοσι εἰς τὸν ἐσόμενον Ἐλαφηβολιῶνα τελέσειν<sup>n</sup>—Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος μηνὸς ἕκτη φθίνοντος... ἐκ Διουνσίων εὐθὺς τῶν ἀστικῶν<sup>o</sup>—Διότι μετὰ τὰ Διοιύσια (sc. τὰ Θαργήλια)· δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι Μουνυχιῶνος καὶ περὶ ἰσημερίαν ἔαρινην ἦγετο Διοιύσῳ ἢ ἑορτῇ p.

ii. Ἀνθεστήρια q. Τὰ Διοιύσια· Οὕτω γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν ἑορτὴν λέγουσι καὶ Ἀνθεστηριῶνα τὸν μῆνα καθ' ὃν ταῦτα ἐτελείτο, ἕπειδὴ ἡ γῆ τότε ἄρχεται ἀνθεῖν. ἢ παρὰ τὸ τὰ ἀνθη ἐπὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ ἐπιφέρειν, ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία·

Θύραζε Κἄρες· οὐκέτ' Ἀνθεστήρια<sup>r</sup>—

Ἀνθεστήρια· τὰ Διοιύσια<sup>s</sup>—Ἀνθεστηριῶν... ἱερὸς Διοιύσου<sup>t</sup>—Χόες<sup>v</sup>... ἑορτὴ τις παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἀγομένη Ἀνθεστηριῶνος δωδεκάτη. φησὶ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀνθεστήρια μὲν καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν ὅλην ἑορτὴν Διοιύσῳ ἀγομένην, κατὰ μέρος δὲ Πιθοῖγια Χόας Χύτρου<sup>x</sup>—

<sup>h</sup> Theophrastus, Ἀδολεσχία.

<sup>i</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>k</sup> Anecdota, 235. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Schol. in Platon. 407. Resp. 265. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. in Æschin. contra Timarchum, 378. ad pag. 26. 17.

<sup>n</sup> Lucian, iii. 309. 53-61. Dialogi Meritric. xi.

<sup>o</sup> Thucydides, v. 19. 20.

<sup>p</sup> Gaza, De Mensibus, iv. 283 B. cf. v. 285 B-C. Add to these statements that of Plutarch (apud Proclum in Hesiod. Opp. et Dies, 502), speaking of the Bœotian month Ἐρμαιῖος, as εἰς ταῦτον ἐρχόμενος τῷ Γαμηλιῶνι, καθ' ὃν

καὶ τὰ Ληναῖα παρ' Ἀθηναίους. cf. supra, Vol. i. page 254: also Hesychius in Ληναίων.

<sup>q</sup> Etym. M. in Ἀνθεστήρια.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. Hesychius, in Θύραζε Κἄρες: also Anecdota Græca Paris. iii. 371. 13. 24. Scholia in Homerum, Παροιμίαι. καὶ ἄκιστος μετ' Ἀνθεστήρια.

<sup>s</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>t</sup> Harpocration: cf. Anecdota Græca, 403. 32.

<sup>v</sup> Harpocration.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. Suidas, Χόες: Photius, Μιαρὰ ἡμέρα: Anecdota, 316. 19.

Δωδεκάτη<sup>γ</sup>· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησιν ἦν Χόας ἔλεγον—Δωδεκεύς· Χοεύς<sup>z</sup>—  
 Χύτροι... ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἀττικὴ τις ἑορτὴ Χύτροι... ἤγγετο δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ  
 Ἀνθεστηριῶνος τρίτη ἐπὶ δέκα, ὡς φησι Φιλόχορος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑορ-  
 τῶν<sup>a</sup>—Eis τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν Χοῶν. ἐπετελεῖτο δὲ Πυαναεψιῶνος  
 ὀγδόῃ, οἱ δὲ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος δεκάτῃ. φησὶ δὲ Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀνθε-  
 στήρια καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν ὅλην ἑορτὴν Διονύσφ ἀγομένην, κατὰ  
 μέρος δὲ Πιθοίγαν Χόας Χύτραν<sup>b</sup>—Ἦγετο δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ (Χύτροι)  
 Ἀνθεστηριῶνος τρίτη ἐπὶ δέκα, ὡς Φιλόχορος<sup>c</sup>—Ἄλλως· Ἐν μιᾷ  
 ἡμέρᾳ ἄγονται οἱ τε Χύτροι καὶ οἱ Χόες ἐν Ἀθήναις . . τῷ Διονύσφ  
 καὶ Ἑρμῇ. οὕτω Δίδυμος<sup>d</sup>.

SECTION V. iv.—*On the reconciliation of these different dates  
 with each other.*

Among these various statements, there is no difference with respect to the proper month of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς—Posideon; nor, excepting the single testimony of Gaza's, with respect to that of the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει—Elaphebolion. But with regard to the proper month of the Dionysia ἐν Λίμναις or ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ, there is very great difference; some of them assigning them to the month Gamelion, others to a month called Lenæon, some to Anthesterion, some to Pyanepsion, and some to Mæmacterion.

Among these, the only true and consistent representation is that which dates them in Anthesterion; and makes the Ἀνθεστήρια, the Λήναια, and the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις or ἐπὶ Ληναίῳ, only different names of one and the same solemnity, celebrated from the eleventh to the thirteenth of its proper month, and divisible into three parts, one for each of these three days, the Πιθόγια on the eleventh, the Χόες on the twelfth, and the Χύτροι on the thirteenth.

With regard to the statements which differ from this; some of them may perhaps be explained by supposing that they have confounded the names of the months in the Attic lunar calendar with those of the months in some one or other of the various types of the Attic Julian calendar, of which we

<sup>γ</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid.

<sup>a</sup> Harpocration: cf. Suidas in Χύτροι: Anecdota, 316. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Scholia in Acharn. 960.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 1075. Ἐπὶ τοῦ χάους γάρ.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cf. Suidas, Χύτροι: Schol. ad

Equites 25, ad Ranas 220. cf. Alkiphron, Epp. ii. 3. Μένανδρος Γλυκέρα. Ἐὼν κατ' ἔτος Χοῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις Ληναίων . . ποίαν αἴρεσιν; ποίους Χύτροις;



gave an account in the first Part of the present work <sup>e</sup>, Pyanepсион and Mæmacterion, on this principle, might not really have meant any thing different from Anthesterion. The month called Lenæon never had any place in the Attic calendar, neither the lunar nor the Julian <sup>f</sup>; but it did occur in the Ionic calendar <sup>g</sup>: and in that it corresponded to Gamelion in the Attic; so that, to assign these Dionysia to Lenæon, was virtually to assign them to Gamelion—as Plutarch, we observe, did.

But probably the true explanation of this statement is, that, as these Dionysia were also *Λήναια*, it was natural to suppose that if there was a month called *Ληναιών* too, these *Λήναια* were celebrated in that month. On the same principle, as these Dionysia were also called *τὰ ἐπὶ ληνῶ*, that name too would appear to intimate that they must have been connected with the vintage season, and have been celebrated either at, or just after, the grape gathering: and that would so far account for another of the extreme statements on this subject, viz. that this kind of the Dionysia in particular was celebrated in the vintage month, Pyanepсион <sup>h</sup>, or the month next after it, Mæmacterion.

Some of these statements however after all can be set down to nothing but the ignorance of the scholiasts and grammarians of later times of the classical rule; such as those in particular, which, in opposition to all the existing evidence to the real state of the case, explain the name of the *Διονύσια Λήναια*, or *ἐπὶ ληνῶ*, as if they literally denoted the *Διονύσια* celebrated *ἐπὶ ληνῶ*. And yet it cannot be denied that the name of this one of the three Dionysia in particular was calculated *a priori* to lead to that conclusion; nor could any presumption, at first sight, be more probable than that the *Διονύσια ἐπὶ ληνῶ* must have been celebrated at the time of the vintage, and must have obtained their name from that coincidence. It was peculiar to these Dionysia too, to be the oldest of their kind, and to be the first which were actually called by the name of the Dionysia, in the secondary sense of the dramatic representations of classical antiquity. And in explanation of the name which appears to have been

<sup>e</sup> Part i. Vol. ii. page 155 sqq.

<sup>f</sup> See Part i. Vol. i. 254 sqq.

<sup>g</sup> Part i. Vol. iii. page 337.

<sup>h</sup> See Part i. vol. i. 385 note.

given them, in contradistinction to the other two, (connecting these and neither of those with the vintage and the wine-press,) nothing could be more apposite than the traditionary account of the origin of tragedy and comedy among the Athenians themselves; viz. that both took their rise out of the sports and festivities, the good humour and merriment, of the vintage, and that both were originally adapted to the vintage season in particular. Hence the name of *Κωμῳδία*; 'Ἐπεὶ κατὰ κώμας ἔστησαν τὴν πρώτην οἱ χοροί<sup>i</sup>. And as the *Etymologicum* adds<sup>k</sup>, 'Ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ τῆς Δημήτρος\*. Hence also the name of tragedy at first, *τρυγοδία*<sup>l</sup>, or *τρυγοκωμῳδία*<sup>m</sup>, "Ἦτοι διὰ τὸ τρύγα ἔπαθλον λαμβάνειν, τουτέστι νέον οἶνον, ἢ διὰ τὸ μὴ ὄντων προσωπέων τὴν ἀρχὴν τρυγῆ χρίεσθαι τὰς ὄψεις. Hence too the explanation of the phrase, *ἐξ ἀμάξης*, from the use of moveable stages or wagons for such exhibitions at first: 'Αθήγησι γὰρ ἐν τῇ τῶν Χοῶν ἐορτῇ οἱ κωμάζοντες ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαξῶν τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας ἔσκωπόν τε καὶ ἐλοιδόρουν· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ὕστερον ἐποίουν<sup>n</sup>—"Ὅσπερ ἐξ ἀμάξης<sup>o</sup>. ἢ λεγομένη ἐορτὴ παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις λήμια, ἐν ἣ ἠγωνίζοντο οἱ ποιηταί... ἐφ' ἀμαξῶν γὰρ οἱ ἄδοντες καθήμενοι ἔλεγόν τε καὶ ἦδον τὰ ποιήματα<sup>p</sup>. This stage was anciently called 'Ελεός: 'Ελεὸς δ' ἦν τράπεζα ἀρχαία, ἐφ' ἣν πρὸ Θέσπιδος εἰς τις ἀναβὰς τοῖς χορευταῖς ἀπεκρίνατο<sup>q</sup>—

Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse Camænæ  
Dicitur et plaustris vexisse poemata Thespis<sup>r</sup>—

Nam et cum promiscue ludi Liberalia vocarentur, honorem Liberi patris manifeste sonabant. Libero enim a rusticis primo fiebant ob beneficium quod ei adscribunt pro demonstrata gratia vini<sup>s</sup>—Nam et alios ludos scenicos Liberalia pro-

\* Hesychius has a gloss, *Προτρυγία*, in the sense of a feast common to Dionysos and Posidon, the name of which would imply that it must have been a ceremony preliminary to the *τρυγητός*, or vintage. And therefore, if celebrated on the day sacred to Posidon, either the 8th of Boëdromion or the 8th of Pyanepsion, and most probably the former.

<sup>i</sup> Pollux, ix. cap. ii. § 11. 981. cf. Aristotle, *Poetica*, iii. 153, 23. Schol. in Platon. 400. De Rep. iii. 122, 8.

<sup>k</sup> In *Τραγωδία*.

<sup>l</sup> Etym. in *Τραγωδία*.

<sup>m</sup> Suidas, in *Τρυγοδία*. Schol. ad *Acharn.* 498.

<sup>n</sup> Photii *Lex.* Τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν.

<sup>o</sup> Scholia in Demosth. De Corona, 268. 13. *Reiskii*.

<sup>p</sup> Cf. Suidas, Τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαξῶν σκώματα. and 'Ἐξ ἀμάξης.

<sup>q</sup> Pollux, iv. xix. § 123.

<sup>r</sup> Horace, De Arte Poetica, 275.

<sup>s</sup> Tertullian, iv. 113. De Spectaculis, 5.

prie vocabant, præterquam Libero devotos, (quot sunt Dionysia apud Græcos,) etiam a Libero institutos t—

Agricola et minio suffusus Bacche rubenti  
Primus inexperta duxit ab arte choros v—

Ἄπὸ μέθης καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας εὕρεσις ἐν Ἰκαρίῳ\* τῆς Ἀττικῆς εὐρέθη, καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς τρύγης καιρόν· ἀφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ τραγωδία τὸ πρῶτον ἐκλήθη ἡ κωμωδία x—Φανόδημος δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ φησὶ τοῦ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου τὸ γλεῦκος φέροντας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ τῶν πίθων τῷ θεῷ κινῶσαι, εἴθ' αὐτοῖς προσφέρεσθαι· ὅθεν καὶ Λιμναῖον κληθῆναι τὸν Διόνυσον, ὅτι μιχθὲν τὸ γλεῦκος τῷ ὕδατι τότε πρῶτον ἐπόθη κεκραμένου y—

Διονυσίης δὲ μοί τις  
φερέτω ροῖαν ὀπώρης z—

Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν (scil. τὴν ὄρχησιν) ἔτεκεν ὁ καιρῶν εἰρηνικώτατος τε καὶ φιλοπαίγμων, ὁ δρέπανα μὲν ἐπὶ βότρυς ἄγων, βότρυς δ' ἐπὶ ληνοῦς, ἑορτὴν δὲ ποιῶν τοῦ Διονύσου τὸ δῶρον... διόπερ καὶ τοῦνομα τοῖς ὄρχησταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τοὺς ὄρχοὺς σκιρτημάτων a—Δοκοῦσι δέ μοι μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν συστήσασθαι ἑορτὰς καὶ τελετὰς θεῶν ἄλλοι τινὲς ἢ γεωργοί· πρῶτοι μὲν ἐπὶ ληνῷ στησάμενοι Διονύσῳ χοροῦς, πρῶτοι δὲ ἐπὶ ἄλφ Δημήτρι ὄργια b—Ἀθηναίοις δὲ ἡ μὲν παλαιὰ μούσα χοροὶ παίδων ἦσαν καὶ ἀνδρῶν, γῆς ἐργάται κατὰ δῆμους ἰστάμενοι, ἄρτι ἀμητοῦ καὶ ἀρότου κεκοιμημένοι, ἄσματα ἄδοντες αὐτοσχέδια. μεταπεσοῦσα δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἐπὶ τέχνην ἀκορέστου χάριτος ἐν σκῆνῃ καὶ θεάτροις, ἀρχὴ τῆς περὶ πολιτείας αὐτοῖς πλημμελείας ἐγένετο c—

Non aliam ob culpam Baccho caper omnibus aris  
Cæditur, et veteres ineunt proscenia ludi,  
Præmiaque ingeniis pagos et compita circum  
Thesidæ posuere, atque inter pocula læti  
Mollibus in pratis unctos saluere per utres d.

\* Susarion, the inventor of comedy, was of Icarus, in Attica. Cf. the Parian Chron. Epochæ xii, Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 16. § 79. pag. 56. l. 3.

t Tertullian, iv. 121. 10.

v Tibullus, ii. i. 55.

x Athenæus, ii. 11. cf. Scholia in Platon. 400. De Rep. iii. 122. 8. The prize in tragedy, originally sweet must, or γλεῦκος, ὃ τρύγα ἐκάλουν. παρ' ὃ καὶ ἦδε τὸ πρὶν τραγωδία κοινῶς ἐλέγετο.

y Athenæus, xi. 13. cf. Hesychius, Λειβήνος. ὃ Διόνυσος. cf. Ἰβηνα, τὸν

ὄνον Κρήτες. Also Νεοῖνια. ἑορτὴ Διονύσου.

z Anacreon, liv. εἰς ἑαυτόν.

a Libanius, iii. 394. 13. lxxiii. Πρὸς Ἀριστείδην ὑπὲρ τῶν ὄρχηστῶν.

b Maximus Tyrius, xxx. 5. 361.

c Ibid. xxxvii. 4. 437.

d Virgil, Georg. ii. 380.

On which Philargyrius: Dionysia: antiquissimi enim, (ludi,) quos rustici confecta vindemia faciebant.

SECTION V. v.— *On the identity of the Dionysia Λήναια, or Ἐν Λίμναις, with the Ἀνθεστήρια.*

It is observable that in the preceding statements not only the name of the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις, but that of the Λήναια, or Διονύσια ἐπὶ ληνῶ, and that of the Ἀνθεστήρια, is given to one class of these scenic representations in particular. If the same thing is meant by the name in each of these instances, it is not of much importance what it may be called; and if the Λήναια and the Ἀνθεστήρια were after all only another name for the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις, the number and kinds of the Dionysia, in this sense of the scenic representations of classical antiquity, will still be the same.

Some of the learned indeed have doubted of this identity; but, as it appears to us, without sufficient reason, or rather contrary both to antecedent probability, and to many other considerations which would tend to establish it. Some of these we shall proceed briefly to state. i. It may fairly be presumed and taken for granted that these Ἀνθεστήρια derived their name from the month Ἀνθεστηριῶν, and therefore must have been celebrated therein. ii. If these Ἀνθεστήρια also were one class of the Διονύσια, they must have been the same with one of the three in general, of which only anything is known from testimony. Now to suppose them the same with the Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς, and yet to have been celebrated in Ἀνθεστηριῶν, would be to make Ἀνθεστηριῶν the same with Ποσειδεῶν: and to suppose them the same with the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει, for the same reason, would confound Ἀνθεστηριῶν with Ἐλαφηβολιῶν. It follows that if they were the same with one of the three, it must have been with the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις, the Λήναια, or ἐπὶ ληνῶ. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that these Διονύσια in particular were certainly celebrated in Ἀνθεστηριῶν, and the Χόες, a part of the Λήναια, on the 12th of Ἀνθεστηριῶν. The Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις therefore, and the Λήναια, and the Ἀνθεστήρια, must have been only different appellations of one and the same solemnity; the two former taken from the locality where it was celebrated, the latter from the month in which it was celebrated.

The proper month consequently of these *Διονύσια* in particular, in the lunar calendar of the Athenians, must have been the second; and the second in the lunar, at the time of the Correction of Solon, having been the second in the primitive solar calendar also, the site of these Dionysia in the Correction of Solon is of importance, as we may probably see by and by, to the question of their previous history. Their proper month was still Anthesterion, according to Philostratus, at the time of the visit of Apollonius to Athens<sup>e</sup>. Ἐπιπλήξαι δὲ λέγεται περὶ Διονυσίων Ἀθηναίους ἃ ποιεῖται σφισιν ἐν ὥρᾳ τοῦ Ἀρθεστηριῶνος κ', τ. λ: and they were still celebrated in Anthesterion in the time of the author of the *Heroica*<sup>f</sup>.

SECTION V. vi.—*On the comparative antiquity of the three kinds of Διονύσια, in the sense of the Dramatic representations at Athens.*

This however brings us to the question of the comparative antiquity of these different kinds of scenic *Διονύσια*: with respect to which there is every reason to conclude that the oldest, and the first associated with the Dionysia, in the proper sense of the rites and services of Dionysos, were the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*, called also, as we have seen, *Διονύσια ἐπὶ Ληνώ* or *Λήναια*, and *Ἀρθεστήρια*.

For, i. it is observable that in several of the preceding statements the temple of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις, the *Λήναιον* properly so called, was the scene of these dramatic exhibitions in general at Athens, before the theatre was built. If so, there must have been a time when the only exhibitions of this kind were these ἐν Λίμναις, the *Λήναια*, or ἐπὶ Ληνώ; and these consequently must have been the original Dionysia. Accordingly they are styled by Thucydides<sup>g</sup> the ἀρχαιότερα *Διονύσια*—common in his time to both the Athenians at home and the Ionians abroad; and celebrated in the same month of the calendar, and on the same day of the month, in each.

ii. It was a circumstance of distinction between the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις* and the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει* that the archon Βασιλεὺς presided at the former, the archon Ἐπώνυμος at the

<sup>e</sup> iv. vii. 177 D.

<sup>f</sup> 694. B. C. Ajax Telamonius.

<sup>g</sup> ii. 15.

latter. Ὁ δὲ ἄρχων διατίθησι μὲν Διονύσια καὶ Θαργήλια μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν ... ἔστι δὲ ἐπώνυμος οὗτος, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ὁ χρόνος ἀριθμεῖται<sup>h</sup> — Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μυστηρίων προσέστηκε μετὰ τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν, καὶ Αθηναίων, καὶ ἀγόνων τῶν ἐπὶ λαμπάδι ... τὴν δὲ συνοικοῦσαν αὐτῷ βασιλίσσαν καλοῦσιν<sup>i</sup>. And as the style of the ἄρχων βασιλεὺς at Athens, like that of the Rex Sacrorum or Sacrificulus at Rome, was derived from that of the kings; it is to be presumed that *his* duties in particular, in contradistinction to those of his colleagues, must have been some of those which before had belonged to the kings. And this distinction, traced upwards, will imply that, while the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει could not have been older than the annual archonships, the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις must have gone back to the time of the kings.

iii. Much light is reflected on this point by Demosthenes, *Contra Neæram*<sup>k</sup>. It appears from that part of the oration that among the other official duties of the archon Rex<sup>l</sup>, from the time of Theseus downwards<sup>m</sup>, one was that of offering certain ἄρρητα ἱερὰ at the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις<sup>n</sup>, ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως: and one of the duties of his wife (whom he was bound to have married a virgin<sup>o</sup>) was that of officiating in the mystical ceremony of being given as wife to Dionysos\*: ἐκδοθῆναι τῷ Διονύσῳ γυνήρ. Καὶ τοῦτον τὸν νόμον γράψαντες, adds the

\* In this part of the duties of the Βασίλισσα or Βασίλινα, fourteen other females were associated with her, whose proper style was Γεραραί: Περὶ γεραρῶν<sup>1</sup>. Αὗται ἄρρητα ἱερὰ Διονύσῳ ἔθνον μετ' ἄλλης θεωρίας. καθίστη δὲ αὐτὰς ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔσας τεσσαρασκαιδέκα — Γεραραί<sup>2</sup>. ἱέρειαι κοινῶς, ἰδίως δὲ αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ, τῷ ἐν Λίμναις, τὰ ἱερὰ ἐπιτελοῦσαι, τῷ ἀριθμῷ δεκατέσσαρες — Γεραραί· αἱ τῷ Διονύσῳ ἱερωμέναι γυναικες<sup>3</sup> — Γεραίραι· παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις γυναικες τινὲς ἱεραί, ἃς ὁ βασιλεὺς καθίστησιν, ἰσαριθμούς τοῖς βωμοῖς τοῦ Διονύσου, διὰ τὸ γεραίρειν τὸν θεόν<sup>4</sup>: from which we learn a fact, nowhere else, so far as we know, to be met with, viz. that the altars of Dionysos at Athens were 14 in number. The *Etym.* adds, Οὔτω Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς.

<sup>1</sup> Pollux, viii. ix. 929. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Hesychius. cf. in Γεραίας, also Schol. ad *Iliad.* Z. 87. Γεραίας.

<sup>3</sup> Harpocration. cf. *Suidas*, Γεραραί: Anecdota, Γεραραίδας.

<sup>4</sup> *Etym.* M.

<sup>h</sup> Pollux, viii. ix. 89. 908.

<sup>i</sup> § 90. 909. cf. Photius, *Append.* 670. Ἐπώνυμος ἄρχων: *Suidas*, Ἡγεμονία δικαστηρίου: Athenæus, xii. 60: Plutarch, *Kimon.* viii.

<sup>k</sup> lix. 94-111.

<sup>l</sup> § 94.

<sup>m</sup> § 98-101.

<sup>n</sup> § 96. 99. cf. 104, 105.

<sup>o</sup> § 99.

<sup>p</sup> § 96. 100. 104. 144. 156.

speaker, (that which related to the ceremonies and duties in question,) ἐν στήλῃ λιθίῃ ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν ἐν Λίμναις. καὶ αὕτη ἡ στήλη ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν ἔστηκεν. ἀμυδροῖς γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς δηλοῦσα τὰ γεγραμμένα· ... καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιοτάτῳ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγνωστάτῳ ἐν Λίμναις ἔστησαν, ἵνα μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσι τὰ γεγραμμένα· ἅπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου ἀνοίγεται. τῇ ὀδοδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀρθεστηριῶνος μηνός.

In this date he agrees with Thucydides; and both will imply that the proper day of this ceremony was that of the Χόες; the second day of the Lemna or Anthesteria of after-times. Now the erection of this pillar, whether truly or not, is nevertheless referred by this author to the time of Theseus and of the *συνοικία*<sup>r</sup>: and that must be decisive on the question of the supposed antiquity of these Dionysia, above that of either of the other two. The site of this temple ἐν Λίμναις too, according to the scholia on Thucyd. ii. 15, being in the Acropolis, these were properly the Διονύσια ἐν πόλει, the original Athens; as the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει were those of the Athens which grew up underneath and about it.

iv. With regard to the origin of the feast of the Χόες itself, a tradition was extant, which traced it back to the time of Orestes; and to the fact of his purification at Athens after the death of Clytemnestra and Ægisthus. This tradition is recognised in the Iphigenia in Tauris; where Orestes himself is giving his sister an account of his reception at Athens on the occasion in question<sup>s</sup>—

Ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκέισε, πρῶτα μὲν μ' οὐδεὶς ξένων  
 ἐκὼν ἐδέξαθ', ὡς θεοῖς στυγούμενον·  
 οἱ δ' ἔσχον αἰδῶ, ξένια μονοτράπεζά μοι  
 παρέσχον, οἴκων ὄντες ἐν ταῦτῳ στέγει,  
 σιγῇ δ' ἔτεκτῆναντ' ἀπόφθεγκτόν μ', ὅπως  
 δαιτὸς γενοίμην πάματός τ' αὐτῶν δίχα·  
 ἐς δ' ἄγγος ἴδιον ἴσον ἅπασι βακχίου  
 μέτρον πληρώσαντες εἶχον ἠδονήν.  
 καὶ γὰρ ἔξελέγξαι μὲν ξένους οὐκ ἠξίουν,  
 ἠλγουν δὲ σιγῇ κἀδόκουν οὐκ εἰδέναι,  
 μέγα στενάζων, οὔνεκ' ἦν μητρὸς φονεὺς.  
 κλύψ δ' Ἀθηναίοισι τὰ μὰ δυστυχῆ  
 τελετὴν γενέσθαι, κᾶτι τὸν νόμον μένειν,  
 χοῆρες ἄγγος Παλλάδος τιμᾶν λεῶν.

<sup>r</sup> § 100.

<sup>r</sup> § 98.

<sup>s</sup> Vers. 947-961.

It appears also in some of the scholia of antiquity; of which it may suffice for our purpose to quote only the following account of it from the scholia on Aristophanes<sup>t</sup>: "Ὅτι Ὁρέστης μετὰ τὸν φόνον εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικόμενος, ἦν δὲ ἑορτὴ Διονύσου Ληναίου, ὡς μὴ γένοιτό σφισιν ὁμόσπονδος ἀπεκτονῶς τὴν μητέρα, ἐμῆχανήσατο τοίονδ' ἐτι Πανδίων· χοᾶ οἴνου τῶν δαιτυμόνων ἐκάστῳ παραστήσας, ἐξ αὐτοῦ πίνειν ἐκέλευσε, μηδὲν ὑπομγύντας ἀλλήλοις, ὡς μήτε ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κρατήρος πίοι Ὁρέστης, μήτε ἐκεῖνος ἄχθοιτο καθ' αὐτὸν πίνων μόνος. καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου Ἀθηναίους ἑορτὴ ἐνομίσθη οἱ Χόες. And this dates the institution in the time of Pandion; yet Athenæus<sup>x</sup>, quoting Phanodemus, shews that *he* dated it in the time of Demophon, the son of Theseus; which would be much more consistent with the circumstances of the case, Demophon and Orestes having been strictly contemporaries. Παρήγγειλέ τε, he adds, καὶ τοῦ ποτοῦ παυσαμένους τοὺς μὲν στεφάνους οἷς ἐστεφανῶντο πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ μὴ τιθέναι, διὰ τὸ ὁμορόφους γενέσθαι τῷ Ὁρέστη, περὶ δὲ τὸν χόα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἕκαστον περιθεῖναι, καὶ τῇ ἱερείᾳ ἀποφέρειν τοὺς στεφάνους πρὸς τὸ ἐν Λίμναις τέμενος, ἔπειτα θύειν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα. And this clearly ascertains the supposed time of this incident to have been that when the Dionysia Λήνια or ἐν Λίμναις were going on: Καὶ ἕκτοτε τὴν ἑορτὴν κληθῆναι Χόας.

Now we may have occasion to shew hereafter that the date of the death of Clytemnestra and Ægistheus in the eighth year after the return of the Greeks from Troy, according to Homer, was nearly the same as that of the death of Agamemnon, in the first year; viz. a certain day in the primitive Gamelion: and whether Orestes is to be supposed to have undergone the ceremony of purification immediately after that event, or, as Euripides implies<sup>y</sup>, after a year's exile, spent among the Parrhasians in Arcadia, it would make no difference to the time of the year, at which it would take place at last; nor consequently to that of his visit to Athens, and of the institution of the feast of the Χόες as a memorial of it. And in either case that would bear date in the second month of the Primitive Greek calendar, the primitive Anthesterion. This tradition therefore proves both the supposed

<sup>t</sup> Ad Acharn. 960. Εἰς τοὺς Χόας. cf. Ad Equites, 95: Suidas, Χόες.

<sup>x</sup> x. 49.

<sup>y</sup> Orestes, 1643 sqq.



antiquity of the *Διονύσια Λήναια*, and their supposed place in the calendar from the first.

With regard to the two other kinds of *Dionysia*, we may now take it for granted that both must have been later than the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*. And though we have no positive authority for the precise time of the institution of either, yet, if the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει* were assigned from the first to the archon Eponymus, it may reasonably be presumed they could not have been older than the annual archonship; the epoch of which did not go further back than B.C. 684<sup>c</sup>. And if the *Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς* were so called from the first, though called also the *Dionysia ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, they must have been older than the enclosure of the Piræus. Now the Piræus was first joined to the city by means of the long walls<sup>a</sup>, immediately after the second invasion (B.C. 479); but it was taken in from the country, and enclosed, in the archonship of Themistocles: which the Tables date B.C. 493, and the true year of which was B.C. 492<sup>b</sup>. The *Dionysia ἐν ἄστει* then could not have been older than B.C. 684. The *Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς* could not have been younger than B.C. 492.

With regard indeed to the former, we are entirely of opinion that they were next in antiquity to the *Dionysia ἐν Λίμναις*; and that as these latter were most probably adopted into the calendar, and attached to their proper date, (the 11th of Anthesterion,) as early as the correction of Solon, so, for reasons which may appear as we proceed, were the former, in the time of the next reformer and legislator of the Athenians, Cleisthenes, about B.C. 510. We have already had occasion to shew that the name of the *Dionysia ἐν Λίμναις*, from the very first, the *Λήναια*, or ἐπὶ Ληνῶ, argued an original connection between them in particular, and the festivities of the vintage season; from which all the writers (ancient or modern) on the history of the classical drama are agreed to derive it. It is not our intention, nor is it necessary for our purpose at present, to enter on this question; which Bentley may be considered to have set at rest, in his cele-

<sup>z</sup> *Supra*, Vol. ii. 31.

<sup>a</sup> *Thucyd.* i. 89-93: *Schol.* in *Aristoph. Equites*, 811-813. 882: *Schol.* in *Platon.* ii. 342. in *Gorgiam*, 22. 16:

*Chron. Arm. Lat. Ol.* 71. 1: *Thes. Tempor. Ol.* 75. 2.

<sup>b</sup> *Cf. Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom.* vi. 34.

brated controversy with Boyle: we will observe only that Comedy was older than Tragedy, and Susarion the inventor of the former, than Thespis the inventor of the latter. And though Plutarch<sup>c</sup> implies that tragedy, as first imagined by Thespis, had already come into existence in the time of Solon; that might be true of the first attempts at comedy, but it could not have been so of those of tragedy. The Parian Chronicle dates the invention of comedy under *Epocha* xl—sometime between *Epocha* xxxix, B. C. 582, and *Epocha* xli, B. C. 561—which is sufficient to prove that it must have been sometime in the life of Solon. But it dates the invention of tragedy by Thespis under *Epocha* xlv, 270 years before the epoch of the Marble, (B. C. 261,) as the text is restored by the learned; i. e. B. C. 531—much too late for Solon: and Suidas assigns it nearly the same date too, Olymp. 61, B. C. 536–532<sup>d</sup>. And this date would be consistent with that of the erection of the theatre, in which the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει* were wont to be celebrated, Olymp. 70, B. C. 500–496<sup>e</sup>. This could scarcely have been as old as the origin of the tragic drama itself, and yet it would probably not be much younger: and we shall perhaps not be mistaken, if we suppose that, the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει* having been taken into the Calendar first about B. C. 510, the theatre was built soon after on purpose for them.

It is probable too that the date of these *Dionysia ἐν ἄστει*, of which nothing is known from testimony, would be determined by the analogy of the *Dionysia ἐν Λίμναις*; and that those would be attached to the 11th of Elaphebolion, as these were to the 11th of Anthesterion. We are able to shew from circumstantial evidence, that their actual date must have fallen about that day of the month. For, i. These *Διονύσια* were over before the 25th of Elaphebolion<sup>f</sup>. ii. They were over before the 18th<sup>g</sup>. iii. If they did not come critically between the 14th and the 18th, they must have been over by

<sup>c</sup> Solon, xxix.

<sup>d</sup> *Θέσπις*. cf. Mr. Clinton's *F. Hellenici*, ad ann. B. C. 535.

<sup>e</sup> Suidas, *Παρίας*. If Phrynichus' play of the *Μιλήτου ἄλωσις* was acted in the theatre, (as it appears from Herodotus, vi. 21, that it was,) the theatre

must clearly have been in existence soon after the close of the Ionic revolt, B. C. 494: see *supra*, Vol. iii. page 329 sqq.

<sup>f</sup> Thucydides, v. 19, 20.

<sup>g</sup> Æschines and Demosthenes: see *supra*, Vol. ii. 94: Metonic dates, xlv.

the 14th also<sup>h</sup>. iv. And yet they were later than the 6th<sup>i</sup>, and later than the 8th<sup>k</sup>. This leaves no room for them, except between the 8th exclusive, and the 11th exclusive: and it may be inferred from the context of Æschines<sup>k</sup>, that their actual date must have been soon after the eighth. He is there recording a decree, which Demosthenes had got passed: *Γράφει ψήφισμα, τοὺς καιροὺς τῆς πόλεως ὑφαίρουμενος, ἐκκλησίαι ποιεῖν τοὺς πρῶταις τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἰσταμένου τοῦ Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος μηνός, ὅτ' ἦν τῷ Ἀσκληπιῶ ἡ θυσία καὶ ὁ προάγων, ἐν τῇ ἰεράῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ὃ πρότερον οὐδεὶς μέμνηται γειόμενον... ἕτα, φησὺν, εἰν ἤδη παρῶσιν οἱ Φιλίππου πρέσβεις, βουλευέσθαι ὁ δῆμος ὡς τάχιστα περὶ τῶν πρὸς Φίλιππον.* And from these observations we learn incidentally that the 8th of Elaphebolion was the day of Æsculapius in the Attic calendar at this time; and, what is more to the purpose, was also the date of the *προάγων*, the rehearsal or preliminary trial of the plays, and the other poetical productions, which were afterwards to enter the lists against each other at the Dionysia. If these began on the 8th, they might last as long as the exhibitions themselves, three days at least; consequently from the 8th inclusive to the 10th inclusive: and on the 11th, the day after their close, the Dionysia might begin<sup>l</sup>.

With regard to the Dionysia *ἐν ἀγροῖς*, or *ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, their date has been conjecturally fixed by Corsini<sup>m</sup> to the third of Posideon; but we have seen from the coincidences still upon record, concerning the deaths of Euripides and Sophocles, and the birthday of Dionysius, the tyrant of Syracuse, and the first assumption of the tyranny there by him<sup>n</sup>, that the actual date of the first day of the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς*, or *ἐν Πειραιεῖ*, must have been the 27th of Posideon. The truth, in our opinion, is that these *Διονύσια* in particular among the Athenians took their rise out of the ancient *Κρόνια* of the primitive solar calendar; attached by Pelops to the Epago-

<sup>h</sup> Thucydides, iv. 118, 119.

<sup>i</sup> Demosthenes, xviii. 66.

<sup>k</sup> Æschines, iii. 66, 67.

<sup>l</sup> Mention is made too of another ceremony, celebrated *ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν Διονυσίων*, called *Φελλός*, or *Φαλλός*; but whether at the Dionysia Lenæa, or the Dionysia *ἐν ἄστει*, does not appear: *Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσόν ἐστὶ*

*τις ἑορτὴ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις Φελλός καλούμενος*: Schol. Aldina in Nubes: cf. Suidas in voce: also in *Φαλῆς*, and *Φαλλός*: Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, vi. x. 294 C: Lucian, iii. 463, *De Dea Syria*, xvi. 65.

<sup>m</sup> See supra, Vol. ii. 407.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. 404 sqq.

menæ of the equable year, (as we hope more fully to shew hereafter.) *Æra Cyclica* 2742, B. C. 1264. This Cronian institution, so attached to the primitive *Epagomenæ*, as we shewed elsewhere<sup>o</sup>, never ceased to be observed among the Greeks; until at last, (having previously been brought by the revolution of the equable in the Julian year into the month of December,) in many instances they passed into the *Saturnalia* of the Roman calendar\*. Plutarch in his own time joins the *Κρόνια* and the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς* as liable to fall out together: Καὶ γὰρ οἱ θεράποντες ὅταν Κρόνια δειπνῶσιν ἢ Διονύσια κατ' ἀγρὸν ἄγωσι περιμόντες, οὐκ ἂν αὐτῶν τὸν δολοθυγμὸν ὑπομείναις καὶ τὸν θόρυβον κ', τ. λ. ς: and we believe it to be the true explanation of the origin of the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς* of the Athenians also, that they took their rise out of the Cronian institution of Pelops, and were first adopted under that name, and introduced into the calendar, when the stated date of the *Cronia*, (in other words, the first of the primitive *Epagomenæ*.) was falling on that day in the month of *Posideon*, which was ever after the stated date of these *Dionysia*, and which we are probably not wrong in assuming as the 27th of that month.

Now *Æra Cyclica* 3504, the primitive *Epagomenæ*, by the Julian rule, were falling December 24 at midnight, B. C.

\* The *Saturnalia* in the Roman calendar having been notoriously in honour of *Saturnus* and *Ops*, and *Saturnus* and *Ops*, among the Romans, having been only other names for *Κρόνος* and *Ύψια*, among the Greeks, (see *supra*, vol. iv. p. 357,) *Macrobius*, *Saturn. i. 10. p. 242, 243*, has an important statement on this question, from *Philochorus*, that even among the Athenians the *Cronia*, as the same with the *Saturnalia*, (so his context implies,) in honour of *Saturnus* and *Ops*, that is, of *Κρόνος* and *Ύψια*, were as old as *Kecrops*: *Philochorus Saturno et Opi primum in Attica statuisset aram Cecropem dicit, eosque Deos pro Jove terraque coluisse, instituisseque ut patres familiarum, et frugibus et fructibus jam coactis, passim cum servis vescerentur, cum quibus patientiam laboris in colendo rure toleraverant: delectari enim Deum honore servorum contemplatu laboris.* This must be decisive that the *Cronia* of *Philochorus* could never have been those of the month *Hecatombæon*, (attached to the 12th,) though they might have been those of *Posideon*, attached to the same date as the *Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς*.

<sup>o</sup> *Supra*, Vol. ii. page 507. cf. 412.

ρ Non posse suaviter, &c. xvi. cf. also *De Vita et Poesi Homerici*, iv.

503; and by the Attic calendar, Cycle xii. 2, of the correction of Solon, Posideon 27 was falling Dec. 24, B. C. 503 also. In our opinion, this was the time of the institution of the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς*, as the representative in the Attic correction of the Cronia of the primitive solar year. The institution of these Dionysia must have been later than that of the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει, B. C. 510, on the one hand, and before the enclosure of the Piræus, B. C. 492, on the other; and B. C. 503 would be seven years later than the former, and eleven years earlier than the latter. And these Dionysia must already have acquired the name of the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς*, or in the country, before they could have begun to receive that of the *Διονύσια ἐν Ἡεραϊεῖ*, which could not have been given them before the enclosure of the Piræus. There would be every reason *a priori* why we should expect to find that both these other kinds of the Dionysia, in the sense of the dramatic representations of the Athenians, were added to the only preexisting one, the Dionysia Lenæa, much about the same time. And these dates of B. C. 510 for the one, and B. C. 503 for the other, are agreeable to that expectation.

We have no proof indeed from testimony of the actual institution of these Dionysia, B. C. 503. But if they really succeeded in the Attic calendar to the place of the Cronia in the Primitive calendar, and if they were really attached to the month Posideon in that calendar, and to some day in that month towards the end of the last decad, and if they were really later than the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει, B. C. 510, yet really older than the enclosure of the Piræus, B. C. 492—the actual year of their institution could not have been any other than Cycle xii. 2 in the correction of Solon, Æra Cycliea 3504, B. C. 503, when the first of the Primitive Epagomenæ, and the first of the Cronia of Pelops, and the 27 Posideon, all met together in the Julian December 24. But with respect to the calendar date of these Dionysia, and whether it was, or was not, as we are supposing, one of the last four days of Posideon, and in all probability the first of the number, we may possibly have it in our power to put it to the test of the matter of fact, in a particular instance, that of the date of the victory of the younger Astydamos at these Dionysia in

particular, according to the Parian Chronicle; characterised as it was by a coincidence of a different kind, the appearance of the comet—with which the ancients connected the destruction of the cities of Helike and Bura. In order therefore to the proof of this coincidence, we shall begin with inquiring into the date of this destruction, and that of the appearance of the comet.

SECTION V. vii.—*On the date of the destruction of Helike and Bura; and of the appearance of the comet, simultaneously with it: and of that of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς deducible from both.*

i. The immediate cause of this destruction is attributed to an earthquake, accompanied by an inundation of the sea, both these cities having been situated on the sea coast: Ἴδη δὲ καὶ πόλεις παρ' ὃ προσεδόκησαν ἀνάστατοι γεγόνασιν αἰφνίδιον· αἱ μὲν ὑπὸ πυρὸς, αἱ δ' ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ, αἱ δὲ τῆς θαλάττης ἐπελθοῦσης. ποῦ μοι Ἑλίκη; κατεπόθη. ποῦ Βούρα; καὶ αὕτη κατεπόθη. δύο πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες ἀπόλωτο ὥσπερ πλέουσαι<sup>q</sup>—Τοῦτον γὰρ τὸν τρόπον καὶ περὶ Ἀχαΐαν γενέσθαι τὸν σεισμόν, ἅμα καὶ τὴν τοῦ κύματος ἔφοδον τοῦ ἐπικλύσαντος τὰς παραθαλασσίους πόλεις Βούραν τε καὶ Ἑλίκην<sup>r</sup>—

Si quæras Helicen et Burin Achæidas urbes,  
Invenies sub aquis; et adhuc ostendere nautæ  
Inclinata solent cum mœnibus oppida mersis<sup>s</sup>—

Helicen Buringue totas mare accepit... supra oppida duo navigatur<sup>t</sup>—Hic Callisthenes in libris quibus describit quemadmodum Helice Burisque mersæ sunt, quis illas casus in mare vel in illas mare immiserit, dicit id quod in priore parte dictum est. spiritus intrat terram per occulta foramina quemadmodum ubique ita et sub mare<sup>v</sup>—Ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ Ἀχαΐαν· ἔξω μὲν γὰρ ἦν νότος, ἐκεῖ δὲ βορέας. νηνεμίας δὲ γενομένης καὶ ῥύεντος εἴσω τοῦ ἀνέμου ἐγένετο τό τε κύμα καὶ ὁ σεισμός ἅμα· καὶ μάλλον διὰ τὸ τὴν θάλατταν μὴ διδόναι διαπνοὴν τῇ ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ὀρμημένῳ πνεύματι, ἀλλ' ἀντιφράττειν<sup>x</sup>—Ἐρατοσθένης

<sup>q</sup> Stobæus, iii. 365. cv. 62. Favonius.

<sup>r</sup> Proclus, in Timæum, A. 133 = 58 B. cf. Scholia in Platonem, ii. 427, 428. Timæus, 18. 20.

<sup>s</sup> Ovid, Metam. xv. 293.

<sup>t</sup> Seneca, Natur. Quæst. vi. xxxii. 8. Opp. v. 363.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. vi. xxiii. 3. Opp. v. 345.

<sup>x</sup> Aristotle, Meteorologica, ii. 8. 66. 28.

δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδεῖν φησὶ τὸν τόπον, καὶ τοὺς πορθμέας λέγειν ὡς ἐν τῷ πόρῳ ὀρθὸς ἐστήκει Ποσειδῶν χαλκῆος, ἔχων ἰππόκαμπον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ, κίνδυνον φέροντα τοῖς δικτυεῦσιν γ—Βοῦρα δὲ καὶ Ἑλικὴ ἢ μὲν ὑπὸ χάσματος ἢ δ' ὑπὸ κύματος ἠφανίσθη<sup>z</sup>.

ii. The ultimate cause is attributed to the μῆνις of Posidon; the motive to which all our authorities assign in an act of violence or impiety, of which the people of Helike had been guilty: according to Polyænus, in surrendering to her enemies a suppliant virgin named Themisto, who had taken refuge in the temple of Posidon<sup>a</sup>; Οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἑλικὴν οἰκοῦντες οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν κατεπόθησαν αὐτοὶ τε καὶ ἡ πόλις, τῆς μὲν γῆς σεισθείσης τοῦ δὲ πελάγους ἐπικλύσαιτος. ἔδοξε τὸ μῆνιμα γενέσθαι τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, ὅτι τὴν ἰκέτειαν αὐτοῦ παρθένου τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐξέδωκαν. According to Diodorus, in the ill treatment of deputies (θεωροὶ) from Ionia, who had been sent to offer sacrifice on the altar of Posidon at Helike; of which he gives the following account<sup>b</sup>: Κατὰ τὴν Ἰωνίαν ἐννέα πόλεις εἰώθεισαν κοινῇ ποιεῖσθαι σύνοδον τὴν τῶν Παιωνίων, καὶ θυσίας συνθύειν ἀρχαίας καὶ μεγάλας Ποσειδῶνι περὶ τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Μυκάλην ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ. ὕστερον δὲ πολέμων γενομένων περὶ τούτους τοὺς τόπους, οὐδυνάμενοι ποιεῖν τὰ Παιωνίω, μετέθεσαν τὴν πανήγυριν εἰς ἀσφαλῆ τόπον, ὅς ἦν πλησίον τῆς Ἐφέσου. πέμφσαντες δὲ θεωροὺς Πυθῶδε χρησμοὺς ἔλαβον, ἀφιδρύματα λαβεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ προγορικῶν αὐτοῖς βωμῶν, ἐξ Ἑλικῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ τότε μὲν Ἰωνίας τῆν δὲ Ἀχαΐας καλουμένης. οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἴωνες κατὰ τὸν χρησμόν ἐπέμφσαν εἰς Ἀχαΐαν τοὺς ληψιομένους τὰ ἀφιδρύματα· οὗτοι δὲ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν διαλεχθέντες ἔπεισαν δοῦναι τὰ ἀξιόμμενα. οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἑλικὴν οἰκοῦντες, ἔχοντες παλαιὸν λόγιον ὅτι τότε κινδυνεύουσιν ὅταν Ἴωνες ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος θύσωσιν, ἀναλογιζόμενοι τὸν χρησμόν ἀντέλεγον τοῖς Ἴωσι περὶ τῶν ἀφιδρυμάτων, λέγοντες μὴ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀλλ' ἴδιον αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸ τέμενος. συνέπραττον δὲ τούτοις καὶ οἱ τὴν Βοῦραν οἰκοῦντες. τῶν δὲ Ἀχαιῶν κοινῷ δόγματι συγχωρησάντων, οἱ μὲν Ἴωνες ἔθυσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος κατὰ τὸν χρησμόν· οἱ δ' Ἑλικεῖς τὰ χρίματα διαρρίψαντες τῶν Ἰώνων τοὺς τε θεωροὺς συνήρπασαν,

<sup>y</sup> Strabo, viii. 7. 221 a. cf. 220 b.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. i. 3. 93 b. cf. Aristotle, i. 396. 17-21. De Mundo ad Alex. iv: Lycophron, 591. et Tzetz. in loc.: Pausanias, vii. vii. 1: xxv. 5: Lucretius, vi. 584: Seneca, v. 350. Nat. Quæst. vi.

xxv. 4: Lucian, iii. 331. Deorum Concl. 5. Schol.: Philostratus, Heroica, 719 D. Neoptolemus: Ammianus Marcellinus, xvii. 7.

<sup>a</sup> viii. xlvi. Θεμιστώ.

<sup>b</sup> xv. 49.

ἠσέβησάν τε εἰς τὸ θεῖον. ἀνθ' ὧν φασι μνησίαντα τὸν Ποσειδῶνα διὰ τοῦ σεισμοῦ καὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τὰς ἀσεβούσας πόλεις λυμῆ-  
νασθαι... πρὸς δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις λέγουσιν ὅτι πλὴν τῶν ἀσεβησάν-  
των οὐδεὶς ἄλλος περιέπεσε τῇ συμφορᾷ.

Pausanias has given substantially the same account; adding this further explanation, that the violence of the people of Helike went so far as to put these Ionians to death; in which he is confirmed by Ælian<sup>c</sup>, who shews also that these suppliants, so treated, were the Ionian θεωροὶ, sent to Helike on the errand related by Diodorus. Ἴόντι δὲ ἐς τὸ πρόσω Σέ-  
λινός τε ποταμὸς καὶ ἀνωτέρω τεσσαράκοιτα Αἰγίου σταδίοις ἐπὶ  
θαλάσση χωρίον ἐστὶν Ἑλίκη<sup>d</sup>. ἐνταῦθα ὄκητο Ἑλίκη πόλις, καὶ  
Ἰωσιν ἱερὸν ἀγιώτατον Ποσειδῶνος ἦν Ἑλικωνίου. διαμεμενηκέναι  
δέ σφισι καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐς Ἀθήνας, καὶ ὕστερον  
ἐξ Ἀθηρῶν ἐς τὰ παραθαλάσσια ἀφίκοντο τῆς Ἀσίας, σέβεσθαι  
Ποσειδῶνα Ἑλικώνιον<sup>e</sup>. καὶ Μιλησίοις τε ἴοντι ἐπὶ τὴν πηγήν: τὴν  
Βιβλιάδα Ποσειδῶνος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν Ἑλικωνίου βωμός. καὶ  
ὡσαύτως ἐν Τέρφ περιβολός τε καὶ βωμός ἐστι τῷ Ἑλικωνίῳ θεῷ  
ἄξιος. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ὀμήρῳ πεποιημένα ἐς Ἑλικὴν καὶ τὸν Ἑλικώ-  
μιον Ποσειδῶνα<sup>f</sup>. χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον Ἀχαιοῖς τοῖς ἐνταῦθα, ἰκέτας  
ἄνδρας ἀποστήσασιν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ ἀποκτείνασιν, οὐκ ἐμέλλησε  
τὸ μῆνιμα ἐκ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, ἀλλὰ σεισμὸς ἐς τὴν χώραν σφισὶν  
αὐτίκα κατασκήψας τῶν τε οἰκοδομημάτων τὴν κατασκευὴν, καὶ ὁμοῦ  
τῇ κατασκευῇ καὶ αὐτὸ τῆς πόλεως τὸ ἔδαφος, ἀφανὲς ἐς τοὺς ἔπειτα  
ἐποίησε<sup>g</sup>. Lastly, the same account of its origin was given  
by Heraclides, a contemporary of the event quoted by Strabo<sup>h</sup>; only that he did not specify the particular ill treat-  
ment to which the Ionic deputies were subjected, and the lengths to which it proceeded: Συμβῆναι δὲ τὸ πάθος κατὰ μῆνιν  
Ποσειδῶνος· τοὺς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλίκης ἐκπεσόντας Ἰώνας αἰτεῖν  
πέμψαντας παρὰ τῶν Ἑλικέων μάλιστα μὲν τὸ βρέτας τοῦ Ποσει-  
δῶνος· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦ γε ἱεροῦ τὴν ἀφίδρυσιν. οὐ δόντων δὲ πέμψαι  
πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. τῶν δὲ ψηφισαμένων, οὐδ' ὡς ὑπακού-  
σαι... τοὺς δ' Ἀχαιοὺς ὕστερον δοῦναι τοῖς Ἰωσιν τὴν ἀφίδρυσιν.

iii. The next observable circumstance of the event is that it happened at night. Ἰρακλείδης δὲ φησι καθ' αὐτὸν γενέσθαι  
τὸ πάθος νύκτωρ, δώδεκα σταδίου διεχούσης τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ θα-

<sup>c</sup> De Natura Anim. xi. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Pausanias, vii. xxiv. 3.

<sup>e</sup> See supra, Vol. iii. page 365 seqq.

<sup>f</sup> Iliad, γ. 404.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. viii. xxiv. 4. 5.

<sup>h</sup> viii. 7. 221 b.



λάσσης, καὶ τούτου τοῦ χωρίου παντὸς σὺν τῇ πόλει καλυφθέντος. δισχιλίους δὲ παρὰ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πεμφθέντας ἀνελέσθαι μὲν τοὺς νεκροὺς μὴ δύνασθαι, τοῖς δ' ὁμόροις νείμει τὴν χώραν<sup>1</sup>—Μελλούσης δὲ οἰκίας καταφέρεσθαι, αὐθιγικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ τε ἐν αὐτῇ μῖες, καὶ μέγχοι καὶ γαλαί, καὶ φθάνουσι τὴν καταφορὰν καὶ ἐξοικίζονται. τοῦτό τοι καὶ φασιν ἐν Ἑλίκῃ γενέσθαι. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἠσέβησαν ἐς τοὺς Ἰωνας τοὺς ἀφικομένους οἱ Ἑλικήσιοι, καὶ ἐπὶ βωμοῦ ἀπέσφαξαν αὐτοὺς, ἐνταῦθα...πρὸ πέριτε (γὰρ) ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀφανισθῆναι τὴν Ἑλικὴν ὅσοι μῦς ἐν αὐτῇ ἦσαν καὶ γαλαί...ἄθροα ὑπέξῃει τῆ ὕδῳ τῇ εἰς Κορίαν ἐκφερούσῃ...ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀνεχώρησαν...νύκτωρ γίνεται σεισμὸς, καὶ συνιζάνει ἡ πόλις, καὶ ἐπικλύσαντος πολλοῦ κύματος ἡ Ἑλικὴ ἠφανίσθη. καὶ κατὰ τύχην Λακεδαιμονίων ὑφορμοῦσαι τῇ πόλει δέκα γῆες συναπώλογο τῇ προειρημένῃ θαλάσσης ἐπικλύσει πολλῇ<sup>k</sup>. Who was in command of these ships at the time is not here mentioned. But we may collect from Diogenes Laertius' Life of Plato<sup>l</sup> that it must have been Polis or Polilis, to whom Plato was delivered by Dionysius in Sicily, to be sold as a slave<sup>m</sup>; and who before this was defeated at Naxos by Chabrias, B. C. 376<sup>n</sup>.

iv. Another observable circumstance is that it happened in the winter. Τῷ δ' ἐξῆς χειμῶνι συμβῆναι τὸ πάθος<sup>o</sup>; i. e. the winter next after the treatment of the deputies in question—Μόνη τε ἡ τοιαύτη κίνησις οὐδὲ τοῦ οἰκισθῆναι ποτε ὑπολείπει σημεῖα ἐν τῇ γῇ. τότε ἰδέαν μὲν ταύτην ἐπὶ τῇ Ἑλίκῃ τοῦ σεισμῷ τὴν ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος ἀνακινουῦσαν, σὺν δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ ἄλλο πῆμα τοιοῦδε, ἐπιγενέσθαι φασὶν ὄρα χειμῶνος. ἐπήλαθε γὰρ σφισιν ἐπιπολὸν τῆς χώρας ἡ θάλασσα, καὶ τὴν Ἑλικὴν περιέλαβεν ἐν κύκλῳ πᾶσαν. καὶ δὴ καὶ τὸ ἄλλος τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐπέσχευεν ὁ κλύδων ὡς τὰ ἄκρα τῶν δένδρων σύνοπτα εἶναι μόνον. σείσαντος δὲ ἐξαίφνης τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁμοῦ τῷ σεισμῷ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀναδραμούσης, καθείκκυσεν ἀνταῖον τὸ κῆμα τὴν Ἑλικὴν<sup>p</sup>. The earthquake however reached no further than Helike and Bura. Ægium, though only four miles distant, escaped, and succeeded to Helike as the metropolis of Achaia<sup>q</sup>. Illa vasta

<sup>i</sup> Strabo, viii. 7. 221 b.

<sup>k</sup> Ælian, De Natura Anim. xi. 19.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. iii. cap. i. § xiv. 19, 20. cf. Schol. in Æschinē, 398. De Corona, 273. Πόλλιν. Στρατηγὸς Λακεδαιμονίων. περὶ οὗ καὶ ὁ Ἀριστείδης λέγει ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων, ὅτι οὗτος ἐπώλησε

τὸν Πλάτωνα. Plutarch, Dion, v.

<sup>m</sup> See supra, Vol. ii. 78. xxii.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. supra, Vol. ii. 82. xxv.

<sup>o</sup> Strabo, viii. 7. 221 b.

<sup>p</sup> Pausanias, vii. xxiv. 6.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. vii. vii. 1. xxiv. 3.

concussio, quæ duas suppressit urbes Helicen et Burin, citra Ægium constitit<sup>r</sup>.

v. With regard to the year of the event; it is dated by Strabo two years before the battle of Leuctra: Κατεκλύσθη δὲ Ἑλίκη δυσὶν ἔτεσι πρὸ τῶν Λευκτρικῶν<sup>s</sup>: by Polybius<sup>t</sup>, one year before Leuctra: and we may infer from both together that it must have happened, though less than two years, yet more than one, complete, before the battle of Leuctra, Hecatombæon 5, July 6, B. C. 371 v. And this would be strictly true of an event which happened towards the end of B. C. 373—one year and six months before another which happened about the middle of B. C. 371. Pausanias dates it in this year<sup>x</sup>: Ἐγένετο δὲ τῆς Ἑλίκης ἀπώλεια Ἀστείου μὲν Ἀθήνησιν ἔτι ἄρχοντας, τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτει τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἑκατὸν, ἣν Δάμων Θούριος ἐνίκα τὸ πρῶτον. Both these notes agree to the end of B. C. 373, or the beginning of B. C. 372.

vi. In the next place, and as one of the most remarkable circumstances of this event, it was accompanied by the appearance of a great comet; so critically too that the earthquake is said to have happened the very night when this comet first became distinctly visible—Callisthenes et alio tempore ait hoc accidisse (an earthquake at Delos). Inter multa, inquit, prodigia, quibus denuntiata est duarum urbium Helices et Buris eversio, fuere maxime notabilia columna ignis immensi, et Delos agitata<sup>y</sup>—Talem effigiem ignis longi fuisse Callisthenes tradit, antequam Burin et Helicen mare absconderet. Aristoteles ait non trabem illam sed cometam fuisse... in quo igne multa quidem fuerunt digna quæ notarentur, nihil tamen magis quam quod ut ille fulsit in cælo statim supra Burin et Helicen mare fuit<sup>z</sup>—Sicut hic (Ephorus) cometen, qui omnium mortalium oculis custoditus est, quia ingentis rei traxit eventus, quum Helicen et Burin ortu suo merserit, ait illum discessisse in stellas duas: quod præter

<sup>r</sup> Seneca, v. 350. Natur. Quæst. vi. xxv. 4. According to Pausanias too, vii. xxv. 5, Bura, (40 stades from the sea, Strabo, viii. 7. 224 b,) though thrown down on this occasion, was resettled by such of its inhabitants as happened to be absent at the time.

<sup>s</sup> viii. 7. 221 a. cf. Euseb. Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 219. ad Olymp. 100. 1 :

Thesaurus Temporum, Ibid. : Orosius, iii. 3. 155, U. C. 376.

<sup>t</sup> ii. 41, 7.

<sup>v</sup> Supra, Vol. ii. 321, Boeotian Calendar.

<sup>x</sup> vii. xxv. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Seneca, v. 351. Natur. Quæst. vi. xxvi. 3.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 375. vii. 5. 2.

illum nemo tradidit<sup>a</sup>. The ancients gave a variety of names to comets, according to the shape which they assumed, their colour, or the like: and among others, that of *δοκοὶ* or *δοκίδες*—which in Latin would be literally *trabes*, and in English, *beams*. Κομήται...δοκίδες<sup>b</sup>—Παρήλιοι δὲ καὶ δοκίδες<sup>c</sup>—Δοκοί<sup>d</sup> εἶδος ἀστέρων, ἐπισημασίαν τινὰ παρεχόντων θεωρεῖσθαι—Eminent et trabes simili modo quas δοκοὺς vocant<sup>e</sup>. And this name in particular was given to those which appeared with a tail of unusual length, but straight like a beam, or resembling an inverted cone: Ὅποτε δὲ ἐπίμηκες ἔχουσι τὸ φῶς καλοῦνται δοκίδες<sup>f</sup>.

The comet, which appeared on this occasion, was of such a kind; and that being understood, the following account of it by Aristotle, who has various allusions to it, will be the more intelligible: Ἄλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀληθὲς ὅτι ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἄρκτου τόπῳ γίνεται κομήτης μόνον, ἅμα καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου οἴτος περὶ θεριῖας τροπᾶς. ὅ τε γὰρ μέγας κομήτης. ὁ γενόμενος περὶ τὸν ἐν Ἀχαΐα σεισμὸν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ κύματος ἔφοδον, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν τῶν ἰσημερινῶν ἀνέσχε, καὶ πρὸς νότον ἤδη πολλοὶ γεγόνασι<sup>g</sup>—Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἄπαντες οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὠμμένοι ἀνευ δύσεως ἠφανίσθησαν, ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀρίζοντος τόπῳ ἀπομαραθίντες κατὰ μικρὸν οὕτως, ὥστε μήτε ἐνὸς ἀστέρος ὑπολειφθῆναι σῶμα μήτε πλειόνων. ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ μέγας ἀστὴρ, περὶ οὗ πρότερον ἐμνήσθημεν, ἐφάνη μὲν χειμῶνος ἐν πάγοις καὶ αἰθρίαις ὑφ' ἑσπέρας ἐπὶ Ἀστειῶν ἄρχοντος. καὶ τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ οὐκ ὤφθη, ὡς προδεδικῶς τοῦ ἡλίου· τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ ὤφθη· ὅσον ἐιδέχεται γὰρ ἐλάχιστον ὑπελείφθη, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔδν. τὸ δὲ φέγγος ἀπέτεινε μέχρι τοῦ τρίτου μέρους τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἶον ἄλμα, διὸ καὶ ἐκλήθη ὀδὸς (δοκός)· ἐπαήλθε δὲ μέχρι τῆς ζῶνης τοῦ Ὠρίωνος, καὶ ἐνταῦθα διελύθη<sup>h</sup>—Καὶ περὶ τὸν μέγαν ἀστέρα τὸν κομήτην ξηρὸς ἦν ὁ χειμῶν· καὶ βόρειος, καὶ τὸ κῆμα δι' ἐναντίωσιν ἐγίγνετο πνευμάτων· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ κόλτῳ βορέας κατείχειν, ἔξω δὲ νότος ἔπνευσε μέγας<sup>i</sup>. There can be no doubt that in the second of these passages ὀδὸς is a corruption of *δοκός* or *δοκίς*. We may collect from these statements, that the first night nothing but the tail of this comet was visible; the second night part

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. 393. vii. xvi. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Pollux, iv. xx. § 159. 444.

<sup>c</sup> Artemidorus, Oneirocritica, ii. 38.

<sup>d</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>e</sup> Pliny, H. N. ii. 26.

<sup>f</sup> Achilles Tatius, in Arati Phænomena, cap. 33. 158 D. cf. Lydus, De

Mensibus, iv. 73. 101, 102. of the various kinds of comets. The fourth which he mentions is this of *Δοκίδες*, which he calls *Δοκίας*.

<sup>g</sup> Meteorologica, i. vi. pag. 11. 29.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 12. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 15. 8. i. vii.

of the head or nucleus was so: the third night, and the following nights, the whole of it, both the tail and the body. And laying this fact along with the other, that the destruction of Ielike and Buris or Bura<sup>k</sup> coincided with the time of the first distinct manifestation of this phenomenon in the sky, we may infer from both that the night of the destruction was, in all probability, the third of those described by Aristotle, when, as he implies, not only the tail, but the body, of the comet must have been visible after sunset.

vii. With the account of the circumstances both of the destruction of the two cities and of the appearance of this comet, which we have thus obtained from other quarters, if we proceed to compare that of Diodorus Siculus also, we shall see there are some differences between his and the rest, which it is worth while to notice. In the first place, while these other accounts seem to make the earthquake and the inundation simultaneous, according to his there was some interval of time between them; the earthquake took place in the night, the inundation in the morning. Ἐπέτειε δὲ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς συμφορᾶς ὁ καιρός. οὐ γὰρ ἡμέρας συνέβη γενέσθαι τὸν σεισμόν, (ἐν ᾗ δυνατὸν ἦν τοὺς κινδυνεύοντας βοηθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς,) ἀλλὰ νυκτὸς τοῦ πάθους συμβάντος, αἱ μὲν οἰκίαι διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ σεισμοῦ καταρριπτούμεναι συνεχέοντο, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι, διὰ τε τὸ σκότος καὶ τὸ τῆς περιστάσεως ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ παράδοξον, ἀδυνατῶς εἶχον ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς σωτηρίας. οἱ μὲν οὖν πλείους ἐναποληθύντες τοῖς πτώμασι τῶν οἰκιῶν ἠφανίσθησαν κ', τ. λ.<sup>1</sup> It is clear from this description also that it happened on a moonless night. He continues: Ἐπιλαβούσης δ' ἡμέρας, τινὲς ἐξεπήδων ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν, καὶ δόξαντες ἐκπεφευγέναι τὸν κίνδυνον, μείζονι καὶ παραδοξοτέρᾳ συμφορᾷ περιέπεσον. τῆς γὰρ θαλάσσης μετεωρισθείσης ἐπὶ πολλὸν, καὶ κύματος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξαιρομένου, κατεκλύσθησαν ἅπαντες, σὺν ταῖς πατρίσιν ἀφανισθέντες. ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο τὸ πάθος τῆς Ἀχαΐας περὶ δύο πόλεις. Ἐλικὴν τε καὶ Βοῦραν· ὧν τὴν Ἐλικὴν τε συνέβαινε μέγιστον τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀχαΐαν πόλεων ἔχειν ἀξίωμα πρὸ τοῦ σεισμοῦ.

<sup>k</sup> Callimachus reads the name Βοῦρα:

Ἐλικὴ τε Ποσειδάωνος ἑταίρη,  
Βοῦρά τε Δεξαμενοῦ βοόστασις Οἰκιάδαο.

iv. Hymnus in Delum, 101.

<sup>1</sup> xv. 48.

In the next place, while our other authorities represent these two events, the destruction of Helike and the appearance of the comet, as simultaneous, Diodorus appears to distinguish between them, and to make the latter later than the former. The earthquake and the destruction, as we have seen, are dated ἐπὶ Ἀστείου, which by Diodorus' rule would be sometime between Jan. 1, B. C. 373, and Jan. 1, B. C. 372<sup>m</sup>. The appearance of the comet seems to be dated by him in the year of Alkisthenes, the archon next to Asteius, sometime, according to his rule, between Jan. 1, B. C. 372, and Jan. 1, B. C. 371. Thus at least does he usher in this year<sup>n</sup>. Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων, (the consuls and the archon just mentioned, those of B. C. 372,) Λακεδαιμονίων ἔτη σχεδὸν πεντακόσια τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐχόντων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, τὸ θεῖον προεσήμαιεν αὐτοῖς τῆς ἀρχῆς τὴν ἀποβολήν. ὤφθη μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπὶ πολλὰς νύκτας λαμπρὰ μεγάλη καομένη, ἀπὸ τοῦ σχήματος ὀνομασθεῖσα πυρίνη δοκίς. μικρὸν δ' ὕστερον ἠτηθέντες οἱ Σπαρτιάται παραδόξως μεγάλη μάχη τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀπέβαλον ἀνεπίστως. ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν φυσικῶν τὴν γένεσιν τῆς λαμπράδος εἰς φυσικὰς αἰτίας ἀνέφερον, ἀποφαινόμενοι τὰ τοιαῦτα φαντάσματα κατηραγασμένως γίνεσθαι χρόνις ὠρισμένοις· καὶ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων τοὺς τε ἐν Βαβυλῶνι Χαλδαίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστρολόγους ποιουμένους προρρήσεις ἐναργεῖς ἐπιτυγχάνειν. τοὺς δὲ μὴ θαυμάζειν, ὅταν γένηται τι τοιοῦτον, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ γένηται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐκάστων περιόδους, αἰωνίοις κινήσεσι καὶ φοραῖς ὠρισμέναις τῶν συντελουμένων. τὴν δ' οὖν λαμπρῶδα τοσαύτην ἐσχηκεῖναι λαμπρότητα καὶ δύναμιν τοῦ φωτὸς, ὥστ' ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σκιὰς ποιεῖν παραπλησίας τῇ σελήνῃ.

In the latter of these distinctions, if really intended by Diodorus, there can be no doubt he must have been mistaken. It was one of the characteristic circumstances of this event, and the most remarkable of all, that the earthquake and the destruction of the two cities happened the same night on which this comet also first became visible. And yet the difference between his account and that of the rest, in this respect, may after all be apparent, more than real, if the comet first became visible just at the end of the year of Asteius, according to his rule, and yet continued to be visible into the year of Alkisthenes, according to the same rule;

<sup>m</sup> The context of his account too, xv. 48, evidently restricts the earthquake to this year.

<sup>n</sup> xv. 50.

both which would actually be the case, if it first appeared towards the end of December, B.C. 373, and continued to be visible even into the month of January, B. C. 372. It is manifest too, that as a prognostic of the approaching downfall of the Spartan empire, it would make no difference to its meaning, or to the construction which was to be put upon it, whether it appeared in December, B. C. 373, or in January, B. C. 372; almost the same distance of time before the battle of Leuctra, in either case.

With respect to the other distinction between his account and that of the rest, that the earthquake happened in the night time, and the inundation in the morning, we see no reason why we should not accept his testimony, not as contrary to that of our other authorities, but simply as explaining them, and adding to their accounts a particular circumstance which might have been implied even in theirs, but is distinctly mentioned only in his. We may infer however from this distinction, that though inundations of the sea, like this, have been known to be caused by earthquakes, yet the inundation in this particular instance was not altogether the effect of the earthquake, the principal violence of which had been already felt the night before; but that a tide of the sea, of greater magnitude than usual, and consequently a spring tide, which happened in the natural course of things to be coinciding with the same time, had something to do with it also. Diodorus' account gives us clearly to understand, that as the night was dark all through, both the earthquake and the inundation must have happened at the beginning or at the end of the lunar month; and this is confirmed by the fact which he mentions of the comet's casting a shadow, while it continued visible, like the moon: which was much more likely to have been the case at a time of the month when the moon was new and young, than when it was at the full. If then there was a spring tide, coincidently with the appearance of this comet, and with this earthquake and inundation, we may take it for granted it must have been at the new moon, not at the full.

Now, while it is seen from these accounts in general that both these things happened in the winter, so is it from that of Aristotle in particular that the appearance of the comet

happened in the *depth* of the winter: Ἐν πάγοις καὶ αἰθρίαις. The winter quarter, in the *Parapegmata* of the Greeks, as we have often had occasion to explain, began at the Πλειάδων δύσις, and terminated at the Ζεφύρου πνοή: and its limits in the solar calendar would be from the first or second week in November, to the first or second week in February. The *μήνες χειμερινοὶ* in the Attic calendar were three in number, two before the solstice, *Mæmaeterion* and *Posideon*, and one after it, *Gamelion*°: and of these, the middle one, *Posideon*, alone could have been that which ordinarily coincided with the depth of winter. If this comet therefore, followed without delay by the earthquake and the inundation, and the destruction of the two cities, appeared ἐν πάγοις καὶ αἰθρίαις, it must have appeared in *Posideon*; and all these things, consequent upon its appearance, and without delay, must have happened in *Posideon* also.

Now the limits of the Attic *Posideon*, Period i. 60, in the Metonic correction, (an intercalary year,) were Nov. 20, and Dec. 19, B. C. 373; the 12th of *Posideon A* of that year being exemptile. The new moon of December, B. C. 373, calculated from our own tables, for the meridian of Helike, is determined to Dec. 17, 12 h. 32 m. 14 s. m. t.\* And the spring tide of this moon, 36 hours after the change, would be realised in its proper magnitude, for the same meridian, only December 19, some time after midnight, which possibly might be, as *Diodorus* describes it, near the break of day; for this is a point which would not depend on the date of the conjunction, Dec. 17, or the realisation of the effect of that conjunction on the tide, Dec. 19, 36 hours later, but on what is called the establishment of the port, or the time of high water, for the meridian in question, that of the ancient Helike. This is seldom for any meridian less than three or four hours after the conjunction. And in this instance it might have been

*	B. C. 373.	h.	m.	s.	
Mean new moon	Dec. 17	9	19	5	m. t. Greenwich.
	Dec. 17	10	48	27	m. t. Helike.
True new moon	Dec. 17	10	52	52	m. t. Greenwich.
	Dec. 17	12	32	14	m. t. Helike.

° See supra, vol. i. 539.

nearer morning than midnight, December 19, and exactly such, in other respects, as it may be collected from the account of Diodorus, the inundation which overwhelmed Helike must have been.

On this principle, the date of the actual destruction must have been December 19, after midnight, Posideon B. 1, reckoned from midnight; but the first distinct appearance of the comet, just before the earthquake and the destruction, must have been Dec. 18, at sunset, (Posideon A. 30 exeunte;) and the three days of its appearance from first to last, actually or virtually specified by Aristotle, must have been December 16, the first, (Posideon 28 exeunte), when nothing but the tail was visible; Dec. 17 the second, (Posideon 29 exeunte), when the head was seen just after sunset; and Dec. 18 the third, (Posideon 30 exeunte), when the whole of it first became visible. It is clear therefore, on this principle, that the first three days of its manifestation, in any sense and to any extent, must have coincided with the last three days of Posideon. And consequently if the stated date of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς coincided with the same month, and the same period of that month, both this appearance of the comet, and the effects which ensued upon it, must have happened at the Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς, B. C. 373.

Now there is an entry in the Parian Chronicle, under Epocha lxxi, which connects the appearance of this comet with the stated time of one of the Dionysia of the Athenians: Ἄφ' οὗ Ἀστυδάμας Ἀθήνησιν ἐνίκησεν ἔτη ΗΓ'ΙΙΙΙ (109) ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀστέιον κατεκλή δὲ τότε κα(ὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἢ μεγάλη λαμπὰς), or as it is otherwise read, κα(τὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἢ πυρὶν δοκίς). Mr. Clinton has justly observed that this must be understood of the first victory of the younger Astydamas<sup>p</sup>; that of the elder having been recorded 26 years before under Epocha lxxvii: but whether of the younger or of the elder, if it synchronised with the appearance of the comet, ἐπὶ Ἀστέιον, it must have been at the Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς, B. C. 373. And the time of the appearance, by the preceding arguments and considerations, having been determined to the last three days of Posideon, B. C. 373, it is a necessary inference from the coincidence

<sup>p</sup> Fasti Hellenici.



that the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς must have been going on in the same month, and at the same time of the month.

On this principle, these Dionysia might very well have been appointed to succeed to the place of the ancient Cronia, Posideon 27, Cycle xii. 2, of the correction of Solon, Epagomene 1, Æra cyc. 3504, Dec. 24, B. C. 503; and their stated date ever after, and in the Metonic calendar as well as in that of Solon, would be Posideon 27. And very possibly they might be appointed at first, to last as long as the ancient Cronia, from Posideon 27 to Gamelion 1, both inclusive; or at least from Posideon 27 to the end of the month: the latter of which is perhaps the more probable supposition of the two\*.

SECTION V. viii.—*On the number of days for which the Scenic representations at Athens lasted.*

With respect indeed to the number of days taken up by the Dionysia of the Athenians in this sense; passages occur in later writers which seem to imply that even the greater Dionysia, the Dionysia absolutely, the Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει, in their time were over in one day<sup>a</sup>: yet this is no necessary proof of the ancient rule in that respect. Plutarch also<sup>r</sup> ob-

\* It is an accidental result of the above investigation into the rule of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς, that it has enabled us to determine with great probability the date of the appearance of the comet, ἐπ' Ἀστέιου, Dec. 18, B. C. 373; which is certainly one of the most remarkable of which there is any account in history. Whether the knowledge of this date may be of use to the astronomers, we leave it to themselves to decide. We will mention only one more confirmation of this date, deducible from the preceding accounts. Aristotle tells us the comet advanced so far east, after passing the sun, as to reach the Zone or Belt of Orion, where it disappeared. That the constellation Orion would be visible for any latitude in Greece, in the month of December, B. C. 373, requires no proof. We will observe only that as the night of the first distinct manifestation of the comet appears to have been that of December 18, so, the meridian passage of ε Orionis, the middle star of the Belt, calculated from our Tables in the same manner as at page 284, Vol. i, for the latitude of the ancient Helike, Dec. 18, B. C. 373, is found to have fallen out about 10 h. 9 m. 24 sec. mean time P. M.

<sup>a</sup> Philostratus, Apollonius, vi. vi. 277 A: Vitæ Soph. Herodes, ii. 547, 548: Lucian, i. 165, 166. Timon, 51.

§ 45: iii. 510. Demosthenis Encom. 27. 51.

<sup>r</sup> De Exsilio, x.

serves of the rule of life of Plato, Xenocrates, Polemo, that they spent all their time in the Academy, except one day, which they devoted to the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει*, and to the tragic representations then taking place: *Πλὴν μίαν ἡμέραν, ἐν ἣ Ἔενοκράτης καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος εἰς ἄστὺ κατῆει Διονυσίων καινοῖς τραγῳδοῖς, ἐπικοσμῶν ὡς ἔφασαν τὴν ἑορτήν.* Yet neither does this, strictly speaking, prove anything of the duration of the whole of these exhibitions even in the time of Xenocrates; only that Xenocrates would not allow himself more than one day for his personal attendance upon them. He mentions likewise<sup>s</sup> that a law was passed at Athens in the time of the orator Lycurgus, to the following effect: *Εἰσήνεγκε δὲ καὶ νόμους, τὸν περὶ τῶν κωμῳδῶν ἀγῶνα τοῖς Χύτροις ἐπιτελεῖν ἐφάμιλλον (τῷ) ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, καὶ τὸν νικῆσαντα εἰς ἄστὺ καταλέγεσθαι, πρότερον οὐκ ἐξόν· ἀναλαμβάνων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκκλειοῖπτα:* which at first sight would seem to imply that the representation of comedy in particular, at the Lenæa, was confined to one day, the last of the three, the day of the *Χύτροι*. And that might have been the case in his time; especially if the exhibitions themselves at the same period of their history had fallen comparatively into desuetude. But the end and intention of this law might also have been to revive the interest in these exhibitions, by bestowing a peculiar privilege on the conquerors in the contests of this kind on one day of the Lenæa in particular, and that the third or last; viz. that they should be allowed to contend, and as we also understand his meaning, with the same plays, at the *Dionysia ἐν ἄστει*, next ensuing, which before they were not privileged to do. For this seems to have been what was here intended by the *εἰς ἄστὺ καταλέγεσθαι*.

When we consider indeed the number of rival compositions, both tragedies and comedies, which had to be exhibited on these occasions (not less than four from every candidate<sup>t</sup>), it will appear to have been physically impossible that the whole of them could have been acted on one day. We may form an idea of the length of one of these *τετραλογίαι* collectively, from the rule which Aristotle lays down for the length of an epic poem<sup>v</sup>—viz. that of one of these *τετραλογίαι*; and

<sup>s</sup> Decem Oratores, vii. Lycurgus.

<sup>t</sup> Diogenes Laertius, Plato, iii. cap. i. § xxxv. 56.

<sup>v</sup> Poetica, 24. 179. 29.

this rule perhaps may be considered to be best exemplified in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, the most artificially constructed of all the epics of antiquity: for this is divided into four Books, each of them about 1160 lines in length, and all together about 5837.

If the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*, or *Λήναια*, took up three days, the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει*, which were not inferior to them in repute and estimation, and were called the *Διονύσια μεγάλα*, or greatest of all, could not have taken up less. And with respect to the *Διονύσια ἐν ἀγροῖς*, we have already seen reason to conclude that, either as succeeding to the place of the ancient Cronia, and of the Epagomenæ of the equable year, they lasted five days, or as attached to Posideon 27, yet confined to that month, they lasted four: and this seems to be confirmed by an anecdote which Plutarch has related of Πῶλος, a celebrated actor of these times: Πῶλον δὲ τὸν τραγωδῶν Ἐρατοσθένους καὶ Φιλόχορος ἰστοροῦσιν ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη γεγεννημένον ὀκτὼ τραγωδίας ἐν τέτταρσιν ἡμέραις διαγωνίσασθαι, μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς τελευτῆς<sup>x</sup> \*. These eight tragedies would be a double τετραλογία: and διαγωνίσασθαι, the term here employed, would imply that none of the four days, taken up by their exhibition in this instance, could have made part of the προάγων or merely preliminary rehearsal. And yet, as we know for certain that the Dionysia Lenæa lasted only

\* This Polus appears to have been the favourite actor of Sophocles: and we collect from Stobæus<sup>1</sup> that he was the principal actor in both the Œdipuses. A. Gellius has related an anecdote of him<sup>2</sup>, which implies in like manner that he was so in the Electra also. His death is mentioned by Ælian<sup>3</sup>.

This Polus is mentioned by Lucian also<sup>4</sup>, along with other eminent actors, Satyrus and Aristodemus, (of both of whom we have had occasion to make mention ourselves in former parts of this Work)—and we learn from these allusions that his proper style was Πῶλος Χαρικλέους Σουνιεύς. A Polus of Ægina too, a disciple of Archias φυγαδοθήρας, is mentioned in Plutarch's Life of Demosthenes<sup>5</sup>, as the most eminent actor of his time, and even of any time before his.

<sup>1</sup> iii. 267. Tit. xvii. 28. Arriani. cf. Plutarch, Fragm. xviii. Ex Epistola De Amicitia, xiv.

<sup>2</sup> vii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> De Natura Anim. vii. 40.

<sup>4</sup> i. 479. Nekuomantia, 16: 712. Pro Mercede Conductis, 5. 10: ii. 688. Jupiter Tragœdus, 41. 79.

<sup>5</sup> Cap. xxviii.

three days, and we do not know for certain that the Dionysia Megala lasted even three, and we have seen reason to conclude that the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς could not have lasted less than four, we may most probably conclude that the occasion on which this Polus acted his part in eight plays, or a double tetralogia, in four consecutive days, was one of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς, and not of either of the other two.

SECTION VI.—*On the Dionysia, in quarters distinct from Athens.*

The Dionysia, as we observed supra γ, in the proper sense of the term, were characteristic of the Greeks everywhere; and there is reason to believe that they were everywhere accompanied with the same kind of ἀγῶνες, μουσικαὶ, σκηρικαὶ, θυμελικαὶ, in general, as among the Athenians. According to Athenæus<sup>z</sup>, the Dionysia were celebrated by Alexander, and a satyrical drama, called Ἄγην, composed for the occasion, was acted, even on the banks of the Hydaspes in India; though the necessity of the case requires that instead of India we should suppose Persia, and instead of the Hydaspes, the Choaspes, to have been really meant, as the scene of this exhibition<sup>a</sup>.

It would be almost an endless task to enumerate all the communities of Hellenic extraction, of which the fact, that they had their Dionysia, is proved by one kind of testimony or another. We will mention those only, the names of which have occurred to us *inter legendum*; Ægæ<sup>b</sup>, Antissa<sup>c</sup>, Astypalæa<sup>d</sup>, Alea in Arcadia, a festival called Σκιερία<sup>e</sup>, Amphicleia or Ophiteia, in Phocis<sup>f</sup>, Ægina<sup>g</sup>, Amorgos<sup>h</sup>, Argos<sup>i</sup>, Arcadia in general<sup>k</sup>, Crastonia<sup>l</sup>, Caria<sup>m</sup>, Coreyra<sup>n</sup>, Kyzicus<sup>o</sup>, Chalkedon<sup>p</sup>, Clazomenæ<sup>pp</sup>, Kynætha in Arcadia<sup>q</sup>, Elis<sup>r</sup>,

γ Page 1.

z xiii. 67, 68.

a See supra, Vol. iii. page 147. 165.

b Schol. in Iliad. N. 21: Eustathius, 917. 41.

c Aristotle, Opp. 1347. 25 a. Οἰκονομικά, ii.

d Corpus Ins. 2483. ii. 381.

e Pausanias, viii. xxiii. 1.

f Ibid. x. xxxiii. 5.

g Corpus Inscript. 2139 b. ii. 1011-1013. l. 41.

h Ibid. 1263 c. 1032. l. 35. cf. 2264 l.

1034. l. 12.

i Plutarch, De Exsilio, xii.: Pausanias, ii. xxiv. 7. called Τύρβη.

k Polybius, iv. 20, 9.

l Aristot. Opp. 842: De Mirabilibus, 122.

m 1351. 36 b. Œcon. ii.

n Corp. Inscript. 1845. ii. 20-25.

o Ibid. 3655. ii. 913. 1-19.

p Ibid. 3794. 972-974. l. 7.

pp Maximus Tyrius, xxii. i. 259.

q Pausanias, viii. xix. 1.

r Aristot. 842: De Mirabilibus, 123:

Eretria<sup>s</sup>, Hermione<sup>t</sup>, Julis in Keos<sup>v</sup>, Lebedus<sup>x</sup>, Larysium in the island Cranaë<sup>y</sup>, Messene<sup>z</sup>, Miletus<sup>a</sup>, Mytilene<sup>b</sup>, Magnesia<sup>c</sup>, Mantinea<sup>d</sup>, Lampsacus<sup>e</sup>, Naupactus<sup>f</sup>, Nicomedia<sup>g</sup>, Naucratis<sup>h</sup>, Olbia<sup>i</sup>, Pesinus<sup>k</sup>, Pellene<sup>l</sup>, Patræ<sup>m</sup>, Potniæ in Bœotia<sup>n</sup>, Parus<sup>o</sup>, Phigaleia in Arcadia<sup>p</sup>, or Phialeia<sup>q</sup>; cf. Steph. Byz. Φιγάλεια; Rhodes<sup>r</sup>, Smyrna<sup>s</sup>, Syrus insula<sup>t</sup>, Salamis<sup>v</sup>, Sparta<sup>x</sup>, Samos<sup>y</sup>, Sikyon<sup>z</sup>, Tenos<sup>a</sup>, Teos<sup>b</sup>, Tarentum<sup>c</sup>, Thurii<sup>d</sup>\*, &c. And though it is impossible at present to say with certainty at what time of the year, or of the calendar, they must have been celebrated, in so many different instances; yet that the rule in general was to celebrate them in that month of their proper calendar, which corresponded to the Attic Gamelion or Anthesterion, may be rendered probable as follows.

\* Cf. Harpocration, Θεοίμια τὰ κατὰ δήμους Διονύσια Θεοίμια ἐλέγετο, ἐν οἷς οἱ γεννηταὶ ἐπέθουον. τὸν γὰρ Διόνυσσον θεοῖον ἔλεγον, ὡς δηλοῖ Αἰσχύλος, καὶ Ἰστρος ἐν ᾧ Συναγωγῶν. Cf. Phot. Lex. Θεοίμιον (Θεοίμια): Suidas, Θεοίμιον—Hesychius, Θεοίμια. θυσία Διονύσου Ἀθήνησι, καὶ θεὸς Θεοίμιος Διόνυσσος. Cf. Phot. Lex., Θεοίμιον ἱερὸν Διονύσου, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ γένος—Anecdota, Θεοίμιον ἱερὸν Διονύσου.—Scholia in Pacem, 874, ἐπαίσαμεν. This would imply that each of the Demes in Attica had its Διονύσια, besides what they all celebrated in common.

Athenæus, i. 61: Pausanias, vi. xxvi. 1. called Θυία: Plutarch, De Mulierum Virtutibus, Μίκα καὶ Μεριστώ: Quæstiones Græcæ, xxxvi.

<sup>s</sup> Corp. Inscript. 2144. ii. 176.

<sup>t</sup> Pausanias, ii. xxxv. 1: Dionysos,

Μελάναιγισ, a musical ἀγών.

<sup>v</sup> Athenæus, x. 84.

<sup>x</sup> Strabo, xiv. 1. 179. ad calc.

<sup>y</sup> Pausanias, iii. xxii. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Plutarch, Cleomenes, xii.

<sup>a</sup> Diodorus, xiii. 104.

<sup>b</sup> Plutarch, Pompeius, xlii.

<sup>c</sup> Athenæus, xii. 45.

<sup>d</sup> Pausanias, viii. vi. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Corp. Inscript. 3640. ii. 906.

<sup>f</sup> Schol. in Aristoph. Acharn. 194:

Suidas, Διονύσια: Ἀύσιοι Τελεταί.

<sup>g</sup> Herodian, v. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Athenæus, iv. 32.

<sup>i</sup> Herod. iv. 79. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Corp. Inscript. 4081. iii. 100, 101.

<sup>l</sup> Pausanias, vii. xxvii. 1. called Λαμ-

πηρία.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. vii. xix. ad fin.: xxi. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. ix. viii. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Corp. Ins. 2374 e. ii. 1074.

<sup>p</sup> Athen. iv. 31.

<sup>q</sup> Diodorus, xv. 40.

<sup>r</sup> Corp. Ins. 2525. ii. 392: Diodorus, xv. 84.

<sup>s</sup> Herod. i. 150.

<sup>t</sup> Corp. Ins. 2347 c. ii. 276, 278.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. 108. i. 149, 150.

<sup>x</sup> Hesychius, Διονυσιάδες: δύσμαιναι: ἔναστρος ὥστε Μαινάς: Ἄλιαν, De Natura Anim. iv. 43.

<sup>y</sup> Etym. Δεύνυσσος. cf. in Διόνυσσος.

<sup>z</sup> Pausanias, ii. vii. 5, 6: Herod. v. 67.

<sup>a</sup> Corp. Inscript. 2330. ii. xii. 251, 252. cf. 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334 c: ii. 1052. l. 60.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 3044. ii. 628-631: 3067. ii. 654-660: Strabo, xiv. 1. 179 ad calc.

<sup>c</sup> Plato, Pars iii. ii. 204. 6. De Legg. 1. cf. Athenæus, iv. 43: 245. 1 sqq. lib. ii: Dio, cxlv. 1-3: Livy, xii: Valerius Max. ii. ii. 5: Florus, i. 18, 4: Orosius, iv. 1. 214: Julian, Misopogon, 355 D.

<sup>d</sup> Diodorus, xii. 10.

SECTION VII.—*Cases of the Διονύσια elsewhere than at Athens, B. C. 346.*

The proceedings preliminary to the conclusion of peace between Philip of Macedon and the Athenians, B. C. 346, were brought to an end Elaphebolion 19, March 19, that year<sup>e</sup>. There was in these times a celebrated actor of tragedy, called Aristodemus<sup>f</sup>, whose name is often mentioned in the history of these negociations: 'Ο μὲν πρῶτος εἰπὼν καὶ μνησθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης Ἀριστόδημος ἦν ὁ ὑποκριτῆς, ὁ δ' ἐκδεξάμενος κ', τ. λ.<sup>g</sup> This actor was personally known to Philip; and was once himself sent to him, Διὰ τὴν γυνῶσιν καὶ φιλοανθρωπίαν τῆς τέχνης<sup>h</sup>.

It is asserted by Æschines that when he, and nine others, were appointed ambassadors to Philip, preliminary to this peace, Demosthenes wished Aristodemus to accompany them: and as he was an actor in great request, and had engagements at this very time in various quarters, in order to set him at liberty, he proposed that the Athenians should make themselves responsible for those engagements in his stead<sup>i</sup>: Οὕτω δ' ἦν πρόθυμος εἰς τὰ πράγματα, ὥστε ἐν τῇ βουλῇ γράφει, (he was serving the office of senator at the time<sup>i</sup>), ἵνα ἀξίμιος ἂν ἡμῖν ὁ Ἀριστόδημος συμπρεσβεύη, ἐλέσθαι πρέσβεις ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις, ἐν αἷς ἔδει τὸν Ἀριστόδημον ἀγωνίζεσθαι, οἵτινες ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ παραιτήσονται τὰς ζημίας<sup>k</sup>. It is manifest therefore that the embassy to Philip was setting out at a time which interfered with these engagements of his, and unless he were to be relieved from them would make him liable to certain fines. The question then is, at what time it was setting out.

Now the peace was finally concluded on the 19th of Elaphebolion; but the ambassadors had returned before the eighth<sup>l</sup>. We must therefore take into account the probable duration of their absence. Demosthenes<sup>m</sup> reckoned it possible for an embassy to have gone from Athens to the Hellespont in ten days, and even in three or four; and so it was, if it went by sea. But this embassy went chiefly by land.

<sup>e</sup> See supra, Vol. ii. 94: also Vol. iii. 65.

<sup>f</sup> See supra, note on Πῶλος.

<sup>g</sup> Demosthenes, xviii. 26.

<sup>h</sup> Æschines, ii. 15, 16.

<sup>i</sup> Æschines, ii. 17.

<sup>k</sup> § 18, 19.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. iii. 66, 67.

<sup>m</sup> xviii. 38.

He himself was one of the ambassadors; and he gives this account of his own movements<sup>n</sup>: "Ὅτε γὰρ τὴν προτέραν ἀπήρμημεν πρεσβείαν τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης κήρυκα ὑμεῖς προαπεστελάτε, ὅστις ἡμῖν σπείσεται. τότε μὲν τοῖνυν ὡς τάχιστα εἰς Ὀρεὸν ἦλθον οὐκ ἀνέμειναν τὸν κήρυκα, οὐδ' ἐποίησαν χρόνον οὐδένα. Ἄλου δὲ πολιορκουμένου, διέπλευσαν εἰς τοῦτον, καὶ πάλιν ἐντεῦθεν πρὸς Παρμενῶνα τὸν πολιορκοῦντα ἐξελλόντες ἀπήραν διὰ τοῦ πολεμίου στρατεύματος εἰς Παγασὰς, καὶ προϊόντες ἀπήντων ἐν Λαρίσση τῷ κήρυκι κ', τ. λ.

This certainly implies that they used all possible despatch. It appears moreover from Æschines<sup>o</sup>, that they had their audience of Philip in Macedonia. And though this interview seems to have detained them only one day, or two, yet if we consider the distance from Athens even to Dium, (180–190 Roman miles,) much more to Pella, and the course which the embassy actually took, (an indirect one for Macedonia,) we cannot suppose it would require less than ten or fifteen days to go, and ten or fifteen to return; or that they could have been absent much less than a month. If then they had already returned before the 8th of Elaphebolion, they must have set out before the 8th of Anthesterion; and the month Anthesterion itself must have been almost entirely taken up with their journey, and the transaction of the business on which they were sent.

It follows that *this* too must have been *one* of the months for which Aristodemus had contracted his different engagements; and consequently the Dionysian month, or one of them, in other quarters besides Athens. He could not indeed have had engagements everywhere for the same time; but he might have had various ones in different quarters, each of which might come in one and the same Attic month. And if he had contracted such engagements for the first month of the calendar, in some of these instances, and for the second in others; yet such were the diversities of calendars at this time, and such their relation to the Attic, that the first month in some, and the second in others, might both be coincident more or less with the same Attic month, whether Anthesterion, or Gamelion.

There is reason consequently to conclude, that the Diony-

<sup>n</sup> xix. 180.

<sup>o</sup> ii. 23. 42: Dem. xix. 183. 171.

sian month, in quarters distinct from Athens, was most generally the first or second month of the Hellenic lunar calendar. In some cases we have circumstantial proof of this fact. We have seen<sup>p</sup> that at Andrus the Dionysian month coincided with the month of January in the Julian calendar, and the stated Dionysian feriæ were the Julian Jan. 5–12. The Dionysia were going on at Miletus, B. C. 405<sup>q</sup>, just about the time when Lysander arrived to take the command of the fleet the second time: which the context fixes to the spring. They were going on at Tarentum, when the outrage was committed on the Roman fleet, which led in its consequences to the Tarentine war; and that too was early in the spring, B. C. 281<sup>r</sup>. The ποιητῶν ἀγῶν at Smyrna bore date on the 18th Lenæon<sup>s</sup>, in the Julian calendar; as the Dionysia did on the 12th in the Lunar, corresponding to the 12th of Anthesterion. At Mytilene in Lesbos this ἀγῶν was going on, when Pompey was there on his way back to Italy, B. C. 61<sup>t</sup>; and that must have been before the consular comitia, at Rome, after his return<sup>v</sup>, and, as it may be collected from the Epistles of Cicero<sup>x</sup>—before the Ides of February, U. C. 693, April 10, B. C. 61, if not before the vi kal. Feb., March 24, the same year<sup>y</sup>. To come to still later times, the Dionysia at Nicomedia in Bithynia, A. D. 218, the first year of Heliogabalus<sup>z</sup>, were going on in the winter\*.

\* We have met with nothing to imply that the scenic representations in question were usually in course, in any other instance, at a different season of the year from that of the Attic in general, except a passage in Lucian, ii. 1. 1, Quomodo historia conscribenda est; which relates the following curious anecdote of the people of Abdera: Ἀβδηρίταις φασί, Λυσιμάχου ἤδη βασιλεύοντος, ἐμπεσεῖν τι νόσημα ᾧ καλὴ Φίλων τοιοῦτο πυρεττεῖν μὲν γὰρ τὰ πρῶτα πανδημειῖ ἅπαντας κ', τ. λ. ἐς γελοίουν δέ τι πάθος περιύστη τῆς γνώμας αὐτῶν. ἅπαντες γὰρ ἐς τραγωδίαν παρεκινουῦντο. . . μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Ἀνδρομέδαν ἐμυφῶδουν. . . καὶ τοῦτο ἐπιπολὺ ἄχρι δὴ χειμῶν, καὶ κρύος δὲ μέγα γενόμενον, ἔπαιυσε ληρουῦντας αὐτούς. αἰτίαν δὲ μοι δοκεῖ τοῦ τοιοῦτου παρασχέιν Ἀρχέλαος ὁ τραγωδὸς εὐδοκίμων τότε, μεσουήτων θέρους ἐν πολλῷ τῷ φλογμῷ τραγωδῆσας αὐτοῖς τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν, ὡς πυρέξειαι τε ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου τοὺς πολλοὺς κ', τ. λ.

<sup>p</sup> Part i. Vol. ii. 680 n.

<sup>q</sup> Diodorus, xiii. 101.

<sup>r</sup> See our Origines Kalendariae Ital., ii. 236 sqq.

<sup>s</sup> Supra Vol. iii. page 298.

<sup>t</sup> Plutarch, Pompeius, xlii.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. xliv.

<sup>x</sup> Ad Atticum, i. 14.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. i. 13, 14. cf. our Origines Kalendariae Italicæ, ii. 47: iii. 376.

<sup>z</sup> Herodian, v. 11. cf. Dio, lxxix. 4. 7. 8: Lampridius, Anton. Heliog. 5.



We shall conclude this part of our subject with one more observation. The *Διόνυσος*, or *Βάκχος*, of the Greeks, it is well known, was the *Liber Pater* of the Romans, and the *Dionysia* of the former were the *Sacra Liberi Patris* of the latter; and in the Latin language were more properly called *Liberalia*. *Liberalia*, *Liberi festa*, quæ apud Græcos dicuntur *Διονύσια* <sup>a</sup>—

Et Dionysiacos Latio cognomine ludos  
Roma colit, Liber quæ sibi vota dicat <sup>b</sup>—

Now Servius has a statement on Virgil's—

Instituit Daphnis thiasos inducere Bacchi <sup>c</sup>—

from which it must be inferred that, in his opinion, the Roman *Liberalia* were instituted by the Dictator Julius Cæsar: Hoc aperte ad Cæsarem pertinet, quem constat primum sacra Liberi Patris transtulisse Roman. This could not have been true, except in some particular sense; for the *Liberalia*, as attached to the xvi. Kal. Apriles, March 17 Roman, entered the calendar in every state, from Numa down to the irregular calendar <sup>d</sup>, the last before the Julian correction. It was however the case, that B. C. 46–45, the first Julian year, (corresponding to Period vi. 7, of the Metonic correction.) the 11th Elaphebolion fell on March 17; and March 17 Julian, and March 17 Roman, in Servius' time, had long been the same: so that, reckoned back from his time, the first *Liberalia* of the Julian correction, March 17 Roman, U. C. 709, and the *Dionysia*, popularly so called, Elaphebolion 11, in the Attic calendar, the same year, would appear to have been the same, and the former to have been transferred to the Roman calendar of the Dictator Julius Cæsar, from the Attic of the time being.

<sup>a</sup> Festus, x. 204. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Ausonius, 385. De Feriis Romanorum, ver. 29. cf. Ovid, Fasti, iii. 703 sqq. Metam. vi. 587 sqq. Æneid, vii.

389–403. 580.

<sup>c</sup> Ecloga v. 30.

<sup>d</sup> See our Origines Kal. Italicæ, ii. 26 n. 545.

## CHAPTER II.

*On the Dionysos of Hellenic antiquity ; on the author of the Dionysia ; and on the Dionysian Correction of the Primitive Calendar.*

SECTION I.—*On the traditional account of the introduction of the name and worship of the Hellenic Dionysos, and of the institution of the Dionysia.*

Ἕλλησι γὰρ δὴ Μελάμπους ἐστὶ ὁ ἐξηγησάμενος τοῦ Διονύσου τό τε οὖνομα καὶ τὴν θυσίην, καὶ τὴν πομπὴν τοῦ φαλλοῦ<sup>c</sup>...τὸν δ' ὦν φαλλὸν τὸν τῷ Διονύσῳ πεμπόμενον Μελάμπους ἐστὶ ὁ κατηγορησάμενος· καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου μαθόντες ποιεῦσι τὰ ποιεῦσι Ἕλληνας...πυθέσθαι δέ μοι δοκείει μάλιστα Μελάμπους τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον παρὰ Κάδμου τε τοῦ Τυρίου, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀφικομένων ἐς τὴν νῦν Βοιωτὴν καλεομένην χώραν<sup>f</sup>—Μελάμποδα δέ φασι μετενεγκεῖν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὰ Διονύσῳ νομιζόμενα τελεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι, καὶ τὰ περὶ Κρόνου μυθολογούμενα, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς Τιτανομαχίας, καὶ τὸ σύνολον τὴν περὶ τὰ πάθη τῶν θεῶν ἱστορίαν<sup>g</sup>—Μελάμποδα δὲ τὸν Ἀμφύονος ἄλλοι φασὶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετακομίσαι τῇ Ἑλλάδι τὰς Δηοῦς ἑορτὰς, πένθος ὑμνούμενον<sup>h</sup>.

The first of these testimonies is express that the name and the rites of Dionysos were introduced into Greece by Melampus; and the two latter ones, that he became acquainted with both in Egypt, and brought them into Greece from Egypt. There are other statements of importance in these testimonies, but at present we propose to confine ourselves to one point, which may be considered established by them, especially by that of Herodotus; viz. that according to the best informed of the Greeks themselves, their own Dionysos, under that name, and his characteristic services, were not older than Melampus. We must therefore begin with inquiring into the history of this Melampus, and what the ancients have left on record concerning him, which may be available for the determination of his time.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. ii. 48.

<sup>f</sup> Herod. ii. 49.

<sup>g</sup> Diodorus Sic. i. 97.

<sup>h</sup> Clemens Alex. Protrepticon, ii. § 13. p. 15. l. 2.

SECTION II.—*On the æra of Melampus, and the mode of determining it.*

There cannot be any doubt that this Melampus, the traditional author of the worship of Dionysos, was the celebrated diviner, so called, whom Virgil associates with Chiron, as a physician also, and possibly with as much historical as poetical propriety; both Chiron and he having been natives of Thessaly, and contemporaries.

Cessere magistri,  
Phillyrides Chiron Amythaoniusque Melampus<sup>1</sup>.

The pedigree of this Melampus is traced by the ancients up to Deucalion, through the intermediate names of Amythaon, Crethes, Æolus, Hellen<sup>k</sup>; which implies that they considered him the fifth in descent from Deucalion. Did we then but know the age of Deucalion, according to the ordinary mode of calculating by genealogies or generations, we might form a probable idea of the time of Melampus, 120 years later. The age of Deucalion, by the Parian Chron., is dated under Epochæ iv. B. C. 1529, which would give that of Melampus, four generations later, B. C. 1409; probably, as we may see by and by, one hundred years too early for the truth. Eusebius<sup>1</sup> dates the acme of Melampus ad Annum Abrah. 649, which would be about 1368; nearer to the truth than the Parian Chronicon, but still much in excess of it, as we may see hereafter.

We are told also, by the same authorities, that as he was thus lineally descended from Deucalion, a native of Thessaly, so he himself was born in Thessaly, though he afterwards migrated to the Peloponnese, and settled first at Pylus, and finally at Argos. But with respect to such questions as these, of the personal existence and history, the age or the acme, of those individuals who make the most conspicuous figure in ancient Greek tradition, we can appeal to no testimony at present, either older or more authentic and trust-

<sup>1</sup> Georgica, iii. 549.

<sup>k</sup> Schol. in Apoll. Rhod. i. 118: in Septem contra Thebas, 554: in Pindari Pythia, iv. 253: Apollodorus, Bibl. i. vii. 3: ix. 11. 12: ii. ii: Hesiod.

Fragm. xxviii: xlviii: Diodor. iv. 68 sqq.

<sup>1</sup> Chron. Arm. Lat. 11. 119: cf. Jerome, Thes. Temp. ad Ann. 648.

worthy, than that of Homer. Let us therefore extract from the Odyssey those passages in which mention is made of Melampus, or of his family before or after him.

- i. Ἔνθ' ἦτοι πρώτην Τυρῶ ἴδον εὐπατέριαν,  
ἧ φάτο Σαλμωνῆος ἀμύμονος ἕκγονος εἶναι,  
φῆ δὲ Κρηθῆος γυνὴ ἔμμεναι Αἰολίδαο·  
· · · · ·  
ἧ δ' ὑποκουσαμένη Περίην τέκε καὶ Νηλῆα,  
τῷ κρατερῷ θεράποντε Διὸς μέγαλοιο γενέσθην  
ἀμφοτέρω· Πελῆης μὲν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ Ἰαωλκῷ  
ναίε πολύρρηνος, ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἐν Πύλῳ ἡμαθῶεντι.  
τοὺς δ' ἑτέρους Κρηθῆϊ τέκεν βασιλεία γυναικῶν,  
Αἴσονά τ' ἠδὲ Φέρητ' Ἀμυθιάου θ' ἱππιοχάρμην<sup>m</sup>.
- ii. Καὶ Χλῶριν εἶδον περικαλλέα, τὴν ποτε Νηλεὺς  
γῆμεν ἐὼν διὰ κάλλος, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα,  
ὀπλοτάτην κούρην Ἀμφίονος Ἰασίδαο,  
ὅς ποτ' ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ Μιννητῶ ἴφι ἄνασεν·  
ἧ δὲ Πύλου βασιλεὺς, τέκεν δὲ οἱ ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,  
Νέστορά τε Χρόμιόν τε Περικλύμενόν τ' ἀγέρωχον.  
τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμην Πηρῷ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,  
τὴν πάντες μνῶοντο περικτίται· οὐδὲ τι Νηλεὺς  
τῷ ἐδίδου ὅς μὴ ἔλικας βοῦς εὐρυμετώπους  
ἐκ Φυλάκης ἐλάσειε βίης Ἰφικληΐης  
ἀργαλέας· τὰς δ' οἶος ὑπέσχετο μάντις ἀμύμων  
ἐξελάαν· χαλεπὴ δὲ θεοῦ κατὰ μοῖρ' ἐπέδησεν,  
δεσμοὶ τ' ἀργαλείοι καὶ βουκόλοι ἀγροῖῳται.  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μῆνές τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐξετελεύητο  
ἄψ περιτελλομένου ἔτεος, καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὥραι,  
καὶ τότε δὴ μιν ἔλυσε βίη Ἰφικληΐης,  
θέσφατα πάντ' εἰπόντα· Διὸς δ' ἔτελείετο βουλή<sup>n</sup>—
- iii. Σχεδόθεν δὲ οἱ ἦλυθεν ἀνὴρ  
τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἄργεος, ἄνδρα κατακτὰς,  
μάντις· ἀτὰρ γενεὴν γε Μελάμποδος ἕκγονος ἦεν,  
ὅς πρὶν μὲν ποτ' ἔναιε Πύλῳ ἔνι, μητέρι μῆλων,  
ἀφνειὸς Πυλίοισι μέγ' ἕξοχα δῶματα ναίων·  
δὴ τότε γ' ἄλλων δῆμον ἀφίκετο, πατρίδα φεύγων,  
Νηλέα τε μεγάλθυμον, ἀγαυότατον ζώντων,  
ὅς οἱ χρήματα πολλὰ τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν  
εἶχε βίη. ὁ δὲ τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροις Φυλάκοιο  
δεσμῷ ἐν ἀργαλέῳ δέδετο, κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων,  
εἵνεκα Νηλῆος κούρης, ἄτης τε βαρείης  
τὴν οἱ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ δασπλήτις Ἐρινύς.

<sup>m</sup> Odys. A. 235. cf. Pindar. Pyth. iv. 252.

<sup>n</sup> A. 281.

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἔκφυγε κῆρα, καὶ ἤλασε βοῦς ἐριμύκους  
 ἐς Πύλον ἐκ Φυλάκης, καὶ ἐτίσατο ἔργον αἰεκέες  
 ἀντίθεον Νηλῆα, κασιγνήτῳ δὲ γυναικα  
 ἠγάγετο πρὸς δῶμαθ'. ὁ δ' ἄλλων ἴκετο δῆμον,  
 "Ἄργος ἐς ἰππόβοτον· τόθι γάρ νύ οἱ αἴσιμον ἦεν  
 ναιέμεναι, πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσσοντ' Ἀργείοισιν.  
 ἔνθα δ' ἔγημε γυναικα καὶ ὑπερεφές θέτο δῶμα,  
 γείνατο δ' Ἀντιφάτην καὶ Μάντιον, νῆε κραταιῶ.  
 Ἀντιφάτης μὲν ἔτικτεν Ὀϊκλῆα μεγάλθυμον,  
 αὐτὰρ Ὀϊκλείης λαοσσόον Ἀμφιάραιον,  
 ὃν περὶ κῆρι φίλει Ζεὺς τ' αἰγίοχος καὶ Ἀπόλλων  
 παντοίην φιλότητ'· οὐδ' ἴκετο γήραος οὐδὸν,  
 ἀλλ' ὄλετ' ἐν Θήβησι γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δῶρων.  
 τοῦδ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντ' Ἀλκμαίων Ἀμφίλοχός τε.  
 Μάντιος αὖ τέκετο Πολυφειδέα τε Κλείτον τε·  
 ἀλλ' ἦτοι Κλείτον χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἡὼς  
 κάλλεος εἵνεκα οἴο, ἔν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείη.  
 αὐτὰρ ὑπέρθυμον Πολυφειδέα μάντιν Ἀπόλλων  
 θῆκε βροτῶν ὄχ' ἄριστον, ἐπεὶ θάνεν Ἀμφιάραιος,  
 ὅς ῥ' Ὑπερησίηνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς·  
 ἔνθ' ὄγε ναιετάων μαντεύετο πᾶσι βροτοῖσι.  
 τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' υἱὸς ἐπῆλθε, Θεοκλύμενος δ' ὄνομ' ἦεν,  
 ὃς τότε Τηλεμάχου πέλας ἴστατο, κ', τ. λ.<sup>ο</sup>

There is much to observe on these statements. i. We learn from the first passage that Amythaon, the father of Melampus, and Neleus, the father of Nestor, were brothers; both were the sons of Tyro, the daughter of Salmoncus, but not by the same father: that Amythaon, and two more, Æson and Pheres, were the sons of Tyro, by Crethes her husband, Neleus, and another, Pelias, his twin brother, by some other person, whose name the fiction of later times disguised under that of the river-god Enipeus, or of Posidon as personating Enipeus. And from this distinction, we may reasonably infer that Amythaon, Æson, and Pheres, the children of Tyro by Crethes, were younger than Neleus and Pelias the fruit of this stolen intercourse; because it is not usual in such fabulous accounts of the birth of these heroes or heroines of old, of a mortal mother and some one or other of the gods of classical mythology, to suppose them born after the marriage of their mother; but it is often so, to represent them as the son and daughter by one of these gods, of some mother, still a virgin at the time, but given in

marriage directly after, to some mortal husband, by whom these children of the gods were to be brought up as his own, or among his own. On this principle Neleus and Pelias, being twins, would both be older, though probably not much older, than Æson, Pheres, and Amythaon.

ii. It is obvious to remark on these names, Pelias and Æson, Neleus and Pheres, that the two former must have been one generation older than the Argonautic expedition, the latter two generations older than the Trojan war. Jason the son of Æson was the captain of the Argonauts, Antilochus the grandson of Neleus, and Eumelus the grandson of Pheres<sup>p</sup>, both served in the Trojan war. So far every thing in these representations of Homer's is consistent. The Trojan war must have been one generation at least later than the Argonautic expedition; and therefore two generations at least later than Neleus and Pelias, Æson and Pheres: and by parity of reason than Amythaon, the brother of Æson and Pheres, also.

iii. It seems to be implied in the second of the above passages that the sons of Neleus and Chloris were only *three*, Nestor, Chromius, and Periclymenus; and yet it appears from the testimony of Nestor himself<sup>q</sup> that they were in reality *twelve*, of whom he was the only survivor; all the rest having been killed by Hercules at the time—

Ἐλθὼν γὰρ ῥ' ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἡρακλεΐη  
 τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων, κατὰ δ' ἕκταθεν ὄσσοι ἄριστοι.  
 δώδεκα γὰρ Νηληΐος ἀμύμονος υἱέες ἦμεν,  
 τῶν οἶος λιπόμην, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πάντες ὄλοντο.

We must therefore suppose that in this reference to them Homer purposely mentioned by name only the youngest and the oldest; leaving it to be understood that the rest were comprehended between them. If so, the order of these names, Nestor, Chromius, Periclymenus, is no proof of the order of birth, except as reckoned from Nestor upwards; on which principle, it will follow that Nestor being the youngest, Periclymenus must have been the oldest, and between *his* birth and Nestor's there must have been as great an interval as, in the natural course of things, might be expected between the birth of the oldest of twelve sons of the same

<sup>p</sup> Iliad, B. 711 sqq. 763: Od. Δ. 798.

<sup>q</sup> Iliad, Δ. 690.

father and mother, and that of the youngest; an interval which might be something considerable.

iv. That Nestor was actually the youngest of the sons of Neleus, though nowhere expressly asserted by Homer, yet seems to have been the general belief of the Greeks of later times; and is more agreeable to his subsequent history; and might be inferred even from the fact of his alone escaping in the midst of the general destruction of his family, to whatsoever that was due: whether to his having been spared by Hercules, on account of his youth itself, or to his having been absent at the time and out of the reach of the immediate danger, or because he only of the family of Neleus had allowed the justice of the demands of Hercules, and had counselled concession<sup>r</sup>. On the other hand, the tradition handed down respecting Periclymenus, and *his* contest with Hercules in particular, (though much of fable was mixed up with that fact<sup>s</sup>;) is equally reasonably an argument that he must have been the oldest of the sons of Neleus, and next to his father the head and champion of the family.

v. Now with respect to the chronology of the Life of Nestor, the testimony of Homer both in the Iliad and in the Odyssey is consistent with itself, and leads only to one conclusion, however improbable *a priori* that may appear; viz. that in the year of the capture of Troy, B. C. 1181, he could not have been much less than 90 years of age; and that B. C. 1171, in the year of the visit of Telemachus to Pylus, he was more than 90\*. We will assume then that, according to

\* The first allusion to the age of Nestor, which occurs in Homer, is the following<sup>1</sup>:

Τῷ δ' ἦδη δύο μὲν γεναὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων  
ἐφθιάθ', οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἄμα τράφεν ἦδ' ἐγένοντο  
ἐν Πύλῳ ἡγαθέη, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνασσειν.

And Ovid understood this to mean that he was then two hundred years old<sup>2</sup>:

Vixi  
Annos bis centum: nunc tertia vivitur ætas.

The date of this allusion was the last year of the siege, B. C. 1181. It

<sup>1</sup> Iliad, A. 250.

<sup>2</sup> Metamorph. xii. 187.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. Schol. in Iliad. B. 336: E. 392: A. 692, 693: Od. A. 286. Hesiod, Scutum, 360: Pindar, Ol. ix. 43: Eustathius ad Odys. A. 285. 1685. 60: Schol. ad Od. Γ. 68: Apollon. Rhod.

i. 156: Apollodorus, ii. vii. 3: Steph. Byz. Γερηνία: Ovid, Metam. xii. 549 sqq.

<sup>s</sup> Cf. Hesiod, Fragn. xxii.

Homer, he could not have been less than 85, B. C. 1181; and therefore could not have been born later than B. C. 1266. On this supposition, if *he* was the youngest, and Periclymenus

could not imply less than that he was then more than sixty; for a generation could not be reckoned at less than thirty years. The next allusion is this:

Τρις γὰρ δὴ μὴν φασιν ἀνάξασθαι γένε' ἀνδρῶν<sup>3</sup>.

the date of which was that of the visit of Telemachus to Pylus, in the tenth year after the capture of Troy, B. C. 1171. We apprehend the meaning of this to have been that Nestor had thrice ruled over a distinct generation of men; and was now ruling over a fourth. As the former then implied that he was more than 60, B. C. 1181, so must this imply that he was more than 90, B. C. 1171; and from both together we may infer that he was about 85, B. C. 1181, and about 95, B. C. 1171: consequently that he was born about B. C. 1266.

It is entirely in unison with this supposition of *his* age in the last year of the siege, when Diomed was about 40, that Homer makes him tell Diomed he was young enough, in comparison of himself, to have been his youngest son—

Ἦ μὴν καὶ νέος ἐσσι, ἐμὸς δέ κε καὶ πᾶσι εἴης  
ὀπλότατος γενηῆφιν<sup>4</sup>—

for in reality he must have been 46 years older than Diomed. Nor are we aware of any fact, in his personal history, mentioned by Homer, which would be inconsistent with this date of his birth, circa B. C. 1266.

There is a long account<sup>5</sup> of his first exploits in war; and another<sup>6</sup> of his victories at the funeral games of Amaryncus king of the Epei; both which Homer has put into his own mouth: and on each of these occasions he speaks of himself as having been opposed, among others, to the two sons of Actor and Molione, Eurytus and Cteatus. Now these two, as we hope to shew hereafter, were both killed at one time by Hercules, B. C. 1244; and from the peculiar circumstances of their death, this date for it may be considered a well authenticated one. It is manifest therefore that both the occasions above alluded to, when these Actoridæ were still alive, must have been earlier than B. C. 1244; but how much earlier does not appear—and we are at liberty to assume it might have been even B. C. 1245 or 46, when Nestor himself would be 20 or 21 years of age.

He is made also to say, in the second of these allusions, that he contended with, and beat, Iphiclus in the foot-race, at the games in question. And that too would have been possible, if Iphiclus, as we may see reason<sup>7</sup> to conclude, must have been born about B. C. 1280; and was consequently fourteen years older than Nestor, B. C. 1245 or 46. He is made indeed to say, on the same occasion, that these games at the funeral of Amaryncus were celebrated by his *sons*; but he does not mention the

<sup>3</sup> Odys. Γ. 245.

<sup>4</sup> Iliad I. 57.

<sup>5</sup> Iliad Α. 735-761.

<sup>6</sup> Iliad Ψ. 629-642.

<sup>7</sup> Infra.



was the oldest, of the sons of Neleus, and Neleus had twelve sons in all, (eleven of them born before B. C. 1266,) it cannot be unreasonable to assume that the birth of these eleven names of these sons. And though it appears from the catalogue of the ships and forces<sup>8</sup>, that Diore, described as Ἀμαρρυκείδης, and the same who was killed in the first battle after this<sup>9</sup>, was the leader of the contingent of the Epei, yet it is not certain whether by this epithet of Ἀμαρρυκείδης a son, or a grandson, was meant. If a grandson, the allusion to his presence at Troy, along with the rest of his contemporaries, 64 or 65 years after the death of Amaryncus, would occasion no difficulty: and even if a son is meant, yet he might have been the youngest of his sons, and possibly only just born at the time of his father's death, and therefore not more than 65 or 66 years old himself, B. C. 1181, in the last year of the siege, nor more than 56 or 57 in the year of the sailing of the expedition. His case would be analogous, in either of these respects, to that of two others, of these chiefs of the Epeans at Troy, Amphimachus and Thalpius, sons of the two Actoridae, as he was of Amaryncus; for these also might have been only just born at the time of the death of their respective fathers, B. C. 1244—and consequently not more than 64 or 65, B. C. 1181—nor than 55 or 56, B. C. 1190.

With respect to the allusion which occurs in another instance<sup>10</sup> to the Lapithæ as the contemporaries of Nestor, and to his own presence, along with Theseus and Pirithous, at the battle of the Lapithæ and the Centaurs, we have seen<sup>11</sup> that the time of this battle must have been 40 or 45 years before B. C. 1181; i. e. B. C. 1121–1126, when Nestor would be about 40 or 45 himself. There is nothing in this allusion to imply that Nestor was younger than any of these his contemporaries: all that he says of himself and them is, that *they* listened to *his* advice at that time—better men, as they were, than those who had succeeded to them, and among whom he was living at this time: which was a good reason why *these* also should listen to *him* now. And in reality he must have been older than Theseus in particular, if he was born B. C. 1266, and Theseus only B. C. 1252. The line indeed which here occurs,

Θησέα τ' Αἰγείδην ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν,

has been suspected as an interpolation<sup>12</sup>—laid to the charge of Pisistratus. It is certainly not noticed by any of the ancient scholia on the place, which have come down to us; though as to its occurrence, *verbatim*, in Hesiod also, who was so much later than Homer, and took so many other things from him<sup>13</sup>, that would be an argument of its genuineness, rather than of the contrary. On this point the reader will decide for himself. Even if this verse was really one of Homer's, it would imply nothing inconsistent with the personal history and the chronology of the life either of Theseus or of Nestor.

<sup>8</sup> Iliad B. 615–624.

<sup>9</sup> Iliad Δ. 517–526.

<sup>10</sup> Iliad A. 260–273.

<sup>11</sup> Supra, Dissertation i. page 516 n.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Plutarch, Theseus, xx.

<sup>13</sup> See supra, Vol. i. 215.

might have taken up from 20 to 30 years; and therefore, if Nestor was born B. C. 1266, that Periclymenus might have been born about B. C. 1296. And from the probable date of the birth of the oldest son of Neleus, we may infer that of the birth of Neleus, 20 or 30 years earlier, B. C. 1326; and from the probable date of the birth of Neleus, that of the birth of Amythaon, (especially if he was the oldest of the three sons of Crethes and Tyro, as we are at liberty to suppose for anything which is known to the contrary), one or two years later, B. C. 1325 or 1324. And in like manner, from the probable date of the birth of Amythaon, we may infer that of the birth of Melampus; only that it is necessary first of all to observe that, according to the above statements of Homer, Amythaon must have had two sons, Melampus and another, whose name is not mentioned by him—though from other testimonies it is known to have been Bias. Now of these two sons, (until the contrary can be shewn to have been the case,) we are at liberty to assume that Melampus was the younger; though probably not much the younger; so that if Amythaon himself was born about B. C. 1324, his eldest son might have been born about B. C. 1299, and his youngest, Melampus, about B. C. 1297.

vi. It appears from the second of the above passages that, besides his sons, Neleus had a daughter also, by Chloris, called Πηρώ. And it might be inferred at first sight, from the mention of this daughter,

Τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμην Πηρῶ τέκε—

that she must have been the youngest of his children, and younger than Nestor, the youngest of his sons. But this is no necessary inference. These words may mean no more than that over and above, besides, or in addition to, his sons, he had a daughter also: on which construction they will affirm nothing of the order of the birth of this daughter, relatively to that of her brothers, and will leave it free to be determined by other considerations, as the necessity of the case may require.

Knowing therefore simply, from the testimony of Homer, the fact that this Pero, the daughter of Neleus, was married to her cousin, the son of Amythaon and brother of Melampus: we may reasonably presume that *her* age at the time of

this marriage, and *that* of her cousin, were proportional one to the other—with this difference only, that whereas the earliest age of marriage for young men, at this period of the history of the world, could not be assumed much before 25, that of young women may be assumed, if necessary, at 11 or 12—especially in the case of those who, because of their singular beauty, were likely to attract suitors at the earliest age. We have seen that Helen must have captivated Theseus at 9 or 10; and have become the wife of Menelaus at 10 or 11, and have had a child by him at 11 or 12<sup>t</sup>. And as Πηρὼ the daughter of Neleus is described by Homer as θαῦμα βροτοῦσι, she too must have been remarkable for her personal attractions, and therefore likely *a priori* to become the object of the suit of lovers, at the earliest age for marriage; and might be actually married to Bias at 11 or 12. On this principle, if he was about 20 at that time, she might be about 11; so that if Bias was born about B. C. 1299, she must have been born about B. C. 1289—seven years after Periclymenus. born, as we have concluded, about B. C. 1296—and proportionally later than Chromius also, if he was the next to Periclymenus. So that the statement of Homer, *supra*, would be literally true, even if construed to imply that she was born *after*, and not merely *in addition to*, these two sons.

vii. The name of Melampus was not mentioned in the second of the above passages; and yet the allusion to the μάντις ἀμόμων, which did there occur, could not have been understood of any other person. But it appears clearly from the third, that the person so alluded to in the second was Melampus. In like manner, neither did it appear from the second passage whether all that this μάντις ἀμόμων was there supposed to have done or suffered, for the sake of the beautiful Pero, was on his own account, as a suitor for her hand himself, or not; and that point too is cleared up by the third, which shews that it was on his brother's account, not on his own, that he went on this adventure to Phylake, and that both the end and the effect of all, which he did or suffered himself in person, was to secure the hand of Pero for his brother Bias. And this must give us an high idea of the strength of his affection for his brother; and so far render the con-

<sup>t</sup> *Supra*, Vol. iv. page 511, note.

clusion, that he was the younger son of Amythaon, so much the more probable.

viii. We may infer however from these omissions of particular circumstances and explanations in Homer's allusions to this adventure, that the story, to which he was referring in each of these instances, was something still well known and remembered in his own time, as it could scarcely fail to be from its singularly interesting and romantic character. And though these omissions of his must necessarily have rendered it obscure, and difficult to be explained, at present, had they not been supplied from other quarters, yet in reality the scholiasts of antiquity have left nothing to desire in this respect: and to their accounts of the same incident in the life and history of the two brothers, we refer the reader <sup>v</sup>, observing only, that the oldest authority for these more circumstantial explanations is Pherekydes.

ix. It appears from them in general that Amythaon had two sons, Bias and Melampus; that among the suitors for the hand of the beautiful Pero, Bias, her cousin, was one; that the price which Neleus set upon his daughter was the beeves of Iphiclus, son of Phylacus, of Phylake, in Thessaly; that Melampus, the brother of Bias, undertook to procure them in his behalf; that he went on this adventure accordingly to Thessaly; and that, after a year of much personal danger and personal suffering, he fulfilled his engagement, and brought the cows of Iphiclus back with him from Thessaly to Pylus, and thereby secured the fair prize of contention to Bias, his brother. And all this, it is evident, is substantially contained even in Homer's allusions to the same things, especially in the third of the preceding passages; and is only more circumstantially and particularly related by the scholiasts and commentators of later times.

x. The story itself is certainly remarkable, and at first sight looks more like romance than real history. It must be admitted too that in the later accounts of it some things are mixed up with it, which may well be received with incredulity; more especially as to the motive which induced the

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Schol. on the *Odyssey*, A. 287 sqq. Eustathius, 1684. 61-1685. 50. Theocritus, *Idyll.* iii. 43: Apollonius,

Rhod. i. 117. Hesiod, *Fragm.* xlii. (Athenæus, xi. 99.)

owner of the cows himself at last to bestow them as a gift on Melampus, after putting him in prison, and keeping him so long in confinement there, for attempting to steal them at first\*. But these improbable circumstances do not appear

\* Our other authorities, in their account of this incident in the life of Melampus, imply that before the coming of Melampus Iphiclus had no children, nor any prospect of having any, owing to some accidental injury, which he had experienced in early life; but that Melampus, by his skill, either as a physician or a soothsayer, having undone the effects of this accident, conciliated his good will thereby, and was rewarded by him with the gift of the cows, for the sake of which he had come to Thessaly.

There is nothing of this kind in either of Homer's allusions to this subject; and as to the question whether Iphiclus had any children or not, it appears from *Iliad* B. 695-705, and N. 681-698, that he had two sons, each of whom served in the Trojan expedition, Protesilaus and Podarkes. And yet if Iphiclus was the contemporary of Melampus, and Protesilaus, his eldest son, was not more than 30, B. C. 1190, in which year the expedition sailed, he must have been born about B. C. 1220, when Melampus would have been seventy-seven years of age, and Iphiclus probably not much less than sixty. It is probable therefore that though he had children, they were born late in his lifetime; and that might have been the foundation of the tradition, above alluded to, of his having been incapable of having children, until relieved or assisted in some way or other by the medicines or charms of Melampus.

It is observable however that, while Homer in the first of the above passages ascribes the release of Melampus to Iphiclus, in the second he seems to ascribe his imprisonment to Phylacus, the father of Iphiclus,

'Ο δὲ τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροις Φυλάκοιο  
δεσμῷ ἐν ἀργαλέῳ δέδετο, κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων.

We cannot help suspecting from this distinction that Melampus really came on this errand in the lifetime of Phylacus, and having been detected in the attempt to steal away his cows, was thrown into prison by Phylacus, and owed his release to the opportune coincidence of the death of Phylacus, at the end of a year's confinement, and to the good will of Iphiclus, his son, which he had conciliated in some manner or other meanwhile. Even on that supposition, it might be said (as it is by Homer) with strict historical propriety, that he brought back with him the beeves of Iphiclus, as much as those of Phylacus. On this principle, we should be at liberty to assume that Melampus having been born about B. C. 1297, Iphiclus might have been born about B. C. 1280, and have been only 17 years younger than Melampus. And though this would suppose him to have been 60, B. C. 1220, at the birth of Protesilaus, even that is not impossible; or he might in reality have been more than 17 years younger than Melampus, and consequently so much less than 60 at the birth of Protesilaus.

Apollonius Rhod. i. 45, reckons him among the Argonauts; but the

in Homer. All that he gives us to understand is that, in some manner or other, Melampus' faculty of divination stood him in good stead, in the time of need; and that not only his liberation from prison at last, but the gift of the cows also, was due to the gratitude of Iphiclus, for some signal service, which he had been enabled to render him by means of that faculty—

Καὶ τότε δὴ μιν ἔλυσε βίη Ἰφικληεΐη,  
θέσφατα πάντ' εἰπόντα· Διὸς δ' ἔτελείετο βουλῆ.

In other respects, there is nothing in the story, so different from the customs and character of these early times, as to render it incredible. It was usual at this period of the history of the world for the young men to purchase their wives by costly gifts, called *ἔδνα* in Greek; and Homer abounds in allusions to that one of the rules of domestic life, even in his own time: and in that manner, as he told us in the second of the above passages, had Neleus himself become possessed of Chloris his own wife,

Ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα.

It was in the power of parents to prescribe what conditions of this kind they pleased, before they parted with their daughters\*. And Neleus, who himself came from Thessaly, knew no doubt of the famous breed of cows there, belonging to Phylacus; and in stipulating with the suitors of his daughter for these, as the price of her hand, he would appear to be doing nothing inconsistent with the custom and practice of the times, which required from them *ἔδνα* of some kind or other, before they could obtain their suit †.

scholiast on the place observes, that neither Pherekydes nor Hesiod did so. Yet it cannot be denied that if that expedition is to be dated any time about B. C. 1250, Iphiclus might have been of a very proper age to take part in it.

\* The custom appears in Genesis, in the history of the patriarch Jacob. Genesis xxxiv. 12: Ask me never so much dowry and gift, is the language of Shechem, anxious to obtain the hand of Dinah.

† There is one circumstantial test of truth, which characterises this story of Neleus and Pero, Bias and Melampus; viz. that it begins with a marriage suit, and ends with the marriage in question, and takes in just one equable year between. The proof of this latter fact indeed we reserve

xi. It appears further, from the third of the above passages, that after the return of Melampus, and the marriage of Bias and Pero, they all migrated from Pylus to Argos; and that here Melampus also married, and had children, one of whose descendants, called Theoclymenus, a great-grandson of Melampus, accosted Telemachus when he was preparing to return from Pylus to Ithaca. And this is competent to prove that the family of Melampus must have continued to live at Argos long after him; but for the more particular explanation of this part of his history too, we must go to the same scholiasts and commentators as before<sup>x</sup>. And from these we learn another remarkable fact in the personal history of Melampus, which also places in a striking light the warmth of his attachment to his brother; viz. that having cured the women of Argos in general, or the daughters of Prætus in particular, of some mental hallucination under which they were labouring, he obtained one of the daughters of Prætus for himself to wife, and a third part of the kingdom along with her, and another third for his brother Bias. And from the time of this partition the ancients date the rise at Argos of three ruling families, that of the Prætidæ, the lineal descendants of Prætus, that of the Biantidæ, those of Bias, and that of the Melampodidæ, those of Melampus.

xii. The account which Homer gives of Theoclymenus, *supra*, is confined to the line of Melampus; but our other

for the present; but that being admitted, in what manner it serves as an internal evidence of the truth of the account will be understood, as soon as it is known that marriages among the Greeks, at this early period, were wont to be celebrated in the first month of the primitive calendar; as we had occasion to explain, in treating of the calendar of Solon, vol. i. p. 95. Marriage suits consequently began in the month before the primitive Gamelion; i. e. in the last month of the primitive year. 'This suit of Bias' must have begun in that month, and Melampus' engagement to fetch the cows of Phylacus must have been made in the same month. His imprisonment consequently in Thessaly would be dated from the end of one equable year, and his release and return with the beginning of the next, in the month appropriated to marriage; and in time for the consummation of the marriage of Bias and Pero in that month.

<sup>x</sup> Schol. on Pindar, Nemea, ix. 30: 225: Pausanias, ii. xviii. 4: Herod. Apollodorus, ii. ii. § 1: i. ix. 22. ad fin.: ii. 49: ix. 34: Virgil, Eclog. vi. 48. Diodorus, iv. 68: Schol. in Odys. O. and Servius, in loc.

authorities have given us the three lines in conjunction ; both that of Prætus, and that of Bias, and that of Melampus, from the time when they began to proceed together. And if we may only assume that Prætus in the first of these instances in the natural course of things must have corresponded rather to Amythaon the father of Bias and Melampus, than to either of them, the consistency of these several lines may be demonstrated by merely exhibiting them in juxtaposition.

*Comparison of the line of the Prætidæ, the Biantidæ, and the Melampodidæ at Argos respectively, from B. C. 1324 downwards.*

Prætidæ.	Melampodidæ.	Biantidæ.
Prætus	Amythaon	Amythaon
Megapenthes	Melampus	Bias
Hipponous	Antiphates	Talaus
Capaneus	Æcles	Adrastus
	Amphiaraus	

} Mantius  
} Polyphides  
} Theoclymenus

That the last names in these lists are those of contemporaries, and in some sense even of *ὁμήλικες*, may be inferred from the fact that they are the names of three out of the seven, who led the first expedition against Thebes. As therefore these lists begin together, and end together, they must have proceeded together, between: and though there is one name more on the list of the Melampodidæ than in either of the other two, that may be no difficulty, if the steps of descent, from Melampus to Amphiaraus, measured by generations, were shorter than the corresponding ones in the other two instances.

xiii. With respect then to the time of the last person and last name in each of these lists, it is determined by the date of the first expedition against Thebes. There were two expeditions against that city; one under the Seven, the other under the children of the Seven, the Epigoni as they were called: and the date of either being known, that of the other is inferentially deducible from it. Now it appears from the testimony of Homer, that two of the Epigoni, Diomed the son of Tydeus, and Sthenelus the son of Capaneus, after the



second expedition against Thebes, took part in the Trojan expedition : and it may be inferred from his testimony likewise that these two of the heroes of Troy were among the youngest, and even in the year of the capture were not much past the flower of their age, if not rather still in their acme, and not more than 40 years old. If so, neither of them could have been born before B. C. 1221 or 1222.

Apollodorus<sup>y</sup> seems to have been of opinion that, between the first expedition under the Seven and the second under the Epigoni, there was not more than ten years' interval ; a supposition which it is easy to shew would be simply impossible. We collect from Homer<sup>z</sup> that Diomed was an infant at the time of the death of Tydeus ; and from Pindar<sup>a</sup> that the same was the case with Thersander, at the time of the death of Polynikes. And this is confirmed by the traditional account of the marriage of Tydeus and Polynikes to the two daughters of Adrastus, Argeia and Deïphobe, respectively, only the year before the expedition. And from what is related also of Evadne and Capaneus, it may be inferred that their marriage too at the time of the expedition must have been of recent date ; and that Sthenelus the son of Capaneus also must have been left an infant at his father's death. It was simply impossible therefore that the second expedition, in which each of these three took part, could have followed within ten years after the first.

xiv. In fact, it may be proved from the history of the Nemean games that the actual interval between the two must have been 20 years. It has been handed down concerning these games, that they were celebrated for the first time, and thereby founded, by the Seven, in the year of their expedition ; and yet were celebrated by the Epigoni also in that of theirs. And as the cycle of these games from the first, like that of the Cronia, the Olympia, and the Isthmia, was quadriennial ; it follows that if there must have been more than four cycles, or sixteen years, between these two occasions, there could not have been less than five, or twenty years. And this appears to have been actually the case ; as may be proved more clearly hereafter. The true year of the second

<sup>y</sup> Bibliotheca, iii. vii. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Iliad. Z. 222.

<sup>a</sup> Olymp. ii. 76. cf. Diodorus Sic. iv. 66.

expedition, and of the second celebration of the Nemean games, was B. C. 1202; that of the first expedition and of the first celebration was B. C. 1222.

xv. The date of the first expedition then being assumed as B. C. 1222; it will follow that neither Amphiarus, in the line of the Melampodidæ, nor Adrastus in that of the Biantidae, could have been at that time less than 20 years of age; and one or both probably were more. With respect to Amphiarus, we read only that he had two sons, Alcmaeon and Amphilocheus, both born before the expedition; but how long before we are not told: though from *his* history before the expedition<sup>b</sup> and *that* of Alcmaeon and Eriphyle after it, it may reasonably be inferred that Alcmaeon must have been still very young at the time of his father's death. But with respect to Adrastus, he was certainly old enough, before the expedition, to have two daughters of a marriageable age, i. e. not less than 11 or 12 years old, and one son, too young to take any part in the first expedition, but old enough, at the time of the second, to be the captain of the expedition itself. We may therefore infer that he could not have been less than 31 or 32, at the time of the first expedition; and consequently, if that was B. C. 1222, must have been born about B. C. 1253, or 1254. And having this datum, we are at liberty to suppose, if necessary, that Talaus his father might not have been more than 24 or 25 at his birth; and consequently might have been born himself, about B. C. 1277, and therefore the marriage of Bias and Pero might have happened about B. C. 1278: to which we have seen reason to determine it.

xvi. In this manner, from the data supplied by Homer, and by our other authorities, it is possible to make out a series of probable and well connected dates, beginning with the birth of Melampus, B. C. 1297, through Antiphates, one of his sons, down to Amphiarus, and the first expedition against Thebes, B. C. 1222. With respect to his descendants in the line of Mantius; all we know is, that Mantius had two sons, Polyphides and Cleitus; of whom Cleitus died in early life, or, as Homer allegorises the fact, was translated to Olympus in the dawn of life by Aurora: and Polyphides,

<sup>b</sup> Scholia in Pind. Nemea, ix. 30.

after the death of Amphiaraus, i. e. after B. C. 1222, was endowed by Apollo with the same gift of soothsaying which had distinguished him; and that Theoclymenus, who accosted Telemachus on the shores of Pylus as he was returning to Ithaca, was the son of this Polyphides, and endowed with the same faculty himself: which, in our opinion, is virtually an argument that he was born after his father became possessed of it, i. e. after B. C. 1222. And as the date of his meeting with Telemachus was B. C. 1171; it will follow that he could not have been more than 50 at the utmost, at that time, and very probably was not more than 30 or 40.

xvii. In fact, though it is by no means easy to arrange these different events, so as to meet all the conditions of the case in each instance, and to contradict no matter of fact, or testimony, which is known to be on record, still it is possible to do it; and we may take our leave of these subjects with embodying the results of these different reasonings in the following synopsis—which, though not proposed as anything more than an approximation to the truth, is nevertheless consistent with testimony *ab extra*, as far as it goes, and with itself; and is recommended by its own probability.

*Chronology of the Melampodidæ and the Biantidæ.*

	B. C.		B. C.
Birth of Neleus .. ..	1326	Birth of Amythaon .. ..	1324
Birth of Pero .. ..	1289	Birth of Bias .. ..	1299
Birth of Nestor .. ..	1266	Birth of Melampus .. ..	1297
Melampus and Phylacus or Iphiclus .. ..	1279	Marriage of Bias and Pero ..	1278

*Melampodidæ.*

*Biantidæ.*

	B. C.		B. C.		B. C.
Antiphates .. ..	1276	Mantius ..	1270	Talaus ..	1277
Cecles .. ..	1257			Adrastus	1254
Amphiaraus .. ..	1240	Polyphides	1240	Argeia ..	1234
Alcmæon .. ..	1223			Deiphobe	1232
Amphilochus .. ..	1222				
<hr/>					
Septem contra Thebas ..	1222	Theoclyme- nus . . . .	1210		
Expedition of the Epigoni	1202				

SECTION III.—*On the number of the Dionysi of antiquity ; and on the opinions entertained concerning them.*

With respect to the number of the Dionysi of classical antiquity ; it does not appear that in the popular belief, and as the object of a common worship among the Greeks, there was more than one, or at the utmost two ; Dionysos the son of Semele, and Dionysos Iacchus, the son of Demeter or Proserpine. But with respect to the opinions of the more philosophical, the more curious and inquisitive, the more learned and better informed, of the ancient Greeks, on that, and similar points—as there were many Apollines, many Athenæ, many Hephæsti, many Artemides, many Hermæ, and even many Zenes, in their view and apprehension of these ideas, so were there many Dionysi.

Dionysos multos habemus<sup>b</sup> : primum e Jove et Proserpina natum : secundum Nilo, qui Nysam dicitur interemisse : tertium Caprio (Cabiros) patre ; eumque regem Asiæ præfuisse dicunt ; cui Sabazia sunt instituta : quartum Jove et Luna, cui sacra Orphica putantur confici : quintum Niso natum et Thyone, a quo trieterides constitutæ putantur—  
 Τέρπανδρός γε μὴν ὁ Λέσβιος<sup>c</sup> Νύσσαν λέγει τετιθηγηκέσαι τὸν Διόνυσον, τὸν ὑπὸ τινῶν Σαβάζιον ὀνομαζόμενον, ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης γενόμενον, εἶτα ὑπὸ τῶν Τιτάνων σπαραχθέντα. φέρεται δὲ καὶ τις μῦθος περὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἀπολλόδωρον, ὡς εἶη γεγινὼς ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Γῆς, τῆς δὲ Γῆς Θεμέλης προσαγορευομένης, διὰ τὸ εἰς αὐτὴν πάντα καταθεμελιούσθαι ἣν κατὰ ἐναλλαγὴν ἐνὸς στοιχείου τοῦ σ Σεμέλην οἱ ποιηταὶ προσηγορεύκασιν. κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ποιητὰς, Διόνυσοι πέντε· πρῶτος Διὸς καὶ Λυσιθέας· δεύτερος ὁ Νείλου, ὁ καὶ βασιλεύσας Λιβύης καὶ Αἰθιοπίας καὶ Ἀραβίας· τρίτος Καβίρου παῖς, ὅστις τῆς Ἀσίας ἐβασίλευσεν, ἀφ' οὗ ἡ Καβιρική τελετὴ τέταρτος ὁ Διὸς καὶ Σεμέλης, ᾧ τὰ Ὀρφείως μυστήρια ἐτελείτο, καὶ ὑφ' οὗ οἶνος ἐκεράσθη· πέμπτος ὁ Νύσου καὶ Θυώνης, ὃς κατέδειξε τριετηρίδα. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οἱ Ἕλληνες. In the Dionysiaca of Nonnus, three only are recognised ; one, the oldest of all, whom he calls Zagreus, the son of Zeus and Proserpine ; the next to him, the son of Zeus and Semele or Thyone, the Dionysos properly so called, in honour of whom his own poem was written : the third, the son of this Dionysos and the

<sup>b</sup> Cicero, De Natura, iii. 23, 58.

<sup>c</sup> Lydus, De Mensibus, iv. 38. 72. l. 11.

nymph Aura, whom he calls Iacchus; the same which the popular belief of after-times associated with Demeter and the Korê at the mysteries<sup>d</sup>. To judge also from the account of Diodorus Siculus, (the fullest and most circumstantial on this point of all which have come down to us, and taken from Dionysius<sup>e</sup>, an author who had collected and compared together all the *παλαιὰ μυθολογία* on these subjects,) the number generally recognised among the Greeks was not more than three; the first and oldest of whom was that one, whose origin the popular belief referred in the first instance to India. This account is too long to be quoted entire; but it may be worth while to extract from it so much as is of use to illustrate the present inquiry<sup>f</sup>.

Ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπεὶ προειρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς περὶ τῆς τοῦ Διονύσου γενέσεως καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πραχθέντων... οἰκείον εἶναι διαλαμβάνομεν προσθεῖναι τὰ μυθολογούμενα περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησι. τῶν δὲ παλαιῶν μυθογράφων καὶ ποιητῶν περὶ Διονύσου γεγραφότων ἀλλήλοις ἀσύμφωνα... δυσχερές ἐστι περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου καὶ τῶν πράξεων εἰπεῖν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἓνα Διόνυσον οἱ δὲ τρεῖς γεγονέναι παραδεδώκασιν<sup>g</sup>. εἰσὶ δ' οἱ γενεῶν μὲν τούτῳ ἀνθρωπόμορφον μὴ γεγονέναι τὸ παράπαν ἀποφαινόμενοι, τὴν δὲ τοῦ οἴνου δόσιν Διόνυσον εἶναι νομίζοντες... οἱ τοίνυν φυσιολογοῦντες περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου καρπὸν Διόνυσον ὀνομάζοντες, φασὶ τὴν γῆν κ', τ. λ. παραδεδωκότων δὲ τῶν μυθογράφων καὶ τρίτην γενεῶν, καθ' ἣν φασὶ τὸν θεὸν ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Δήμητρος τεκνωθέντα διασπασθῆναι μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν γηγενῶν καὶ καθεψηθῆναι, πάλιν δ' ὑπὸ τῆς Δήμητρος τῶν μελῶν συναρμοσθέντων, ἐξ ἀρχῆς νέον γεννηθῆναι· εἰς φυσικὰς τινὰς αἰτίας ἀνάγουσι τοὺς τοιοῦτους λόγους.

Τῶν δὲ μυθογράφων<sup>h</sup> οἱ σωματοειδῆ τὸν θεὸν παρεισάγοντες τὴν μὲν εὔρεσιν τῆς ἀμπέλου... αὐτῷ προσάπτουσι· περὶ δὲ τοῦ πλείους γεγονέναι Διονύσου ἀμφισβητοῦσιν. ἔνιοι μὲν γὰρ ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνονται γενέσθαι τὸν τε καταδείξαντα τὰ κατὰ τὰς οἰνοποιίας κ', τ. λ. καὶ τὸν στρατευσάμενον ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἔτι δὲ τὸν τὰ μυστήρια καὶ τελετὰς καὶ βακχείας εἰσηγησάμενον. ἔνιοι δὲ... τρεῖς ὑποστησάμενοι γεγονέναι κατὰ διεσθηκότητα χρόνου, ἐκάστῳ προσάπτουσι ἰδίας πράξεις. καὶ φασὶ τὸν μὲν ἀρχαιότατον Ἰνδὸν γεγονέναι, καὶ τῆς χώρας αὐτομάτως διὰ τὴν εὐ-

<sup>d</sup> See supra, Vol. iv. page 255 sqq.  
<sup>g</sup> Cf. v. 75.

<sup>e</sup> iii. 66.  
<sup>h</sup> iii. 63.

<sup>f</sup> iii. 62.

κρασίαν φερούσης πολλήν ἄμπελον, πρῶτον τοῦτον ἀποθλίψαι βότρυας κ', τ. λ.— Δεύτερον δὲ μυθολογοῦσι γενέσθαι Διόνυσον<sup>i</sup> ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης, ὡς δέ τινες ἐκ Δήμητρος. τοῦτον δὲ παρεισάγουσι πρῶτον βοῦς ὑπ' ἄροτρον ζεύξαι κ', τ. λ. τρίτον δὲ γενέσθαι Διόνυσόν φασιν ἐν Θήβαις ταῖς Βοιωταῖς ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Σεμέλης τῆς Κάδμου<sup>i</sup>. ... αὐταὶ μὲν οὖν αἱ γενέσεις συμφωνοῦνται μάλιστα παρὰ τοῖς παλαίοις<sup>k</sup>.

Ποησόμεθα δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Διόνυσου<sup>l</sup>, διὰ τὸ καὶ παλαιὸν εἶναι σφόδρα τοῦτον, καὶ μεγίστας ἐνεργεσίας κατατεθείσθαι τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων. εἴρηται μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν ἐν ταῖς προειρημέταις βίβλοις ὅτι τινὲς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀντιποιοῦνται τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου. Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν γὰρ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς θεὸν Ὀσιριν ὀνομαζόμενον φασιν εἶναι τὸν παρ' Ἑλληνσι Διόνυσον καλούμενον.... ὁμοίως δὲ τοὺς Ἰνδοὺς τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀποφαίνεσθαι γεγενῆσθαι.... ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ μέρος τὰ περὶ τούτων εἰρηκότες ὑνὺ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλληνσι περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου λεγόμενα διέξιμεν— After which<sup>m</sup> follows an account of the Theban Dionysos, son of Zeus and Semele—Μυθολογοῦσι δέ τινες καὶ ἕτερον Διόνυσον γεγενῆσθαι πολὺ τοῖς χρόνοις προτεροῦντα τούτου. φασὶ γὰρ ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης Διόνυσον γενέσθαι τὸν ὑπὸ τιῶν Σαβάξιον ὀνομαζόμενον.... λέγουσι δ' αὐτὸν.... πρῶτον ἐπιχειρήσαι βοῦς ζευγνύειν, καὶ διὰ τούτων τὸν σπόρον τῶν καρπῶν ἐπιτελεῖν κ', τ. λ.<sup>n</sup>

And as the ancients were thus divided in opinion concerning the number of their Dionysi; so were they with respect to their nature. It appears from the preceding statements, that, according to some, Dionysos was not a person of any kind, but simply an abstract idea; that of the fruits of trees in contradistinction to those of the ground: according to others, Dionysos was the name of a person, but common to three individuals, one the author of the discovery of the use of the vine; another the author of the art of agriculture, and of the inventions and helps instrumental thereto; the third the agent in those actions which tradition attributed to a person, so called—the conquest of India, the return in triumph to Greece, the institution of the orgies and mysteries as such. According to others, Dionysos was the principle of humidity, both in vegetable and in animal nature, or the principle of the sap in trees, or the abstract conception of the

<sup>i</sup> iii. 64.<sup>k</sup> Ibid. 66.<sup>l</sup> iv. 1.<sup>m</sup> Ibid. 2. 3.<sup>n</sup> iv. 4.

juices and liquor of the vine<sup>o</sup>. According to Lydus, he was the principle of heat or warmth, diffused through the whole of living nature, and as essential to its continuance as to its propagation in every form and shape<sup>p</sup>: *Διόνυσός ἐστι τὸ ἐν τῷ πυρὶ γεινόμενον πνεῦμα, τουτέστι τὸ θερμόν... οὗτος γὰρ ἐστι τὸ θερμόν πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ πάσης σπορᾶς παντὸς ζωοῦ πνευματικῶδ συγκατατιθέμενον εἰς ζωογονίαν καὶ αὔξησιν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*: for which reason he was both male and female in the same nature and the same person; and was capable both of being dissolved and reduced to the first principles of his being, and of being put together again, and reviving in the same or a similar form, according to a perpetual cycle.

Others of the ancients again considered *Διόνυσος* only another name for the sun—

*Ἥλιος, ὃν Διόνυσον ἐπικλήσιν καλέουσιν*<sup>q</sup>—

*Καίτοι τὸν μὲν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἕτιοί φασι εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὕτω νομίζετε*<sup>r</sup>.—On which supposition, Dionysos and Demeter, so regularly associated in the popular apprehension, were only other names for the sun and moon respectively.—

Vos o clarissima mundi

Lumina, labentem cœlo quæ ducitis annum

Liber et alma Ceres<sup>s</sup>.—

Stoici<sup>v</sup>...eundem solem eundem Liberum eundem Apollinem vocant. item Lunam eandem Dianam, eandem Cererem, eandem Junonem, eandem Proserpinam dicunt<sup>x</sup>—Sed constat secundum Porphyrii librum quem Solem appellavit triplicem esse Apollinis potestatem: et eundem esse solem apud superos, Liberum patrem in terris, Apollinem apud inferos. unde etiam tria insignia circa ejus simulacrum videmus, Lyram quæ nobis cœlestis harmoniæ imaginem monstrat; Gryphen quæ eum etiam terrenum numen ostendit; Sagittas quibus infernalis deus et noxius indicatur. unde et Apollo dictus est, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπολεῖν*<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Cf. supra, Vol. iv. p. 256. Dissertation ii.

<sup>p</sup> P iv. 95. 109. l. 18.

<sup>q</sup> Macrobius, Saturn. i. 18. 302. Ex Orpheo.

<sup>r</sup> Dio Chrys. xxxi. i. 570. 30. Rhodiaca.

<sup>v</sup> Georgica, i. 5.

<sup>w</sup> Servius, in loc.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. ad Æneid. vi. 118.

<sup>y</sup> Ad Eclog. v. 66: cf. ad Æneid. vi. 78: iii. 138: Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 18.

Others however, as we also collect from the above representations of Diodorus, considered the Greek Dionysos to have been merely the Hellenic name for the Egyptian Osiris. According to these, Osiris was the Egyptian Dionysos, and Dionysos was the Grecian Osiris; and nothing more. Nor can there be any doubt that these two opinions, one of which identified Dionysos with the Sun, and the other with Osiris, expressed the real belief of the first author of the idea and of this name for it among the Greeks; that, according to his apprehension of his own conception, the Hellenic Dionysos was nothing essentially different from the Egyptian Osiris, nor either in general different from the Sun<sup>z</sup>. It follows, that whatsoever held good of the nature, the attributes, the relations, and offices of the Egyptian Osiris, *mutatis mutandis*, must have been equally true of the Hellenic Dionysos. If Osiris was the great principle of vegetable and animal life, Dionysos must have been so too. If Osiris was the proper active or masculine agent in the work of universal production, Dionysos must have been so likewise.

SECTION IV.—*On the etymon and meaning of the name of Διόνυσος.*

On this question however, of what must have been intended by the author of this idea and impersonation of the Grecian Dionysos, we are most likely to arrive at the truth by inquiring first of all into the meaning of the name which was given it; i. e. ascertaining if possible, on some rational and consistent principle, the etymon of this name of Διόνυσος in Greek. We say on some rational and probable principle, —and therefore very different from such explanations as have been proposed by the ancients. Plato, with the usual infelicity of his attempts of this kind, derives it from διδόναι and οἶνος; as if it was first and properly Διδοίνησος, or Διδοίνυσος: Ὀν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διδόναι τὸν οἶνον ὁ Πλάτων παράγει, καὶ Διδοίνησον τοῦτον ποιεῖ, εἶτα καὶ Διόνυσον<sup>a</sup>.—Ὁ τε γὰρ Διόνυσος εἶη ἂν ὁ διδοὺς τὸν οἶνον, Διδοίνυσος ἐν παιδιᾷ καλούμενος<sup>b</sup>. But the major part of the grammarians and scholiasts of an-

<sup>z</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 91. 121.

<sup>a</sup> Scholia in Hesiod. *Opp. et Dies*, pag. 33. *Μοῦσαι. De Baccho.*

<sup>b</sup> Platon. *Pars ii. Vol. ii. p. 51. l. 4. Cratylus.*



tiquity explain the name by some reference to the elements of which it appeared at first sight to have been composed, Ζεὺς, and ὕσαι or Νύσος—finding a reason for it in some circumstance of the history of the birth, or the bringing up, of the subject of the name itself—Διόνυσος ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῆς Νύσης τοῦ ὄρους. οἱ δὲ Διόνυξος· κερασφόρος γὰρ τεχθεὶς ἔνυξε τὸν μηρὸν τοῦ Διὸς<sup>c</sup>—ῤεύς. Σαβάξιος<sup>d</sup>—ῤῆ· ἢ Σεμέλη<sup>e</sup>. ἀπὸ τῆς ὕσεως, καὶ ὕε δειλέ—ῤῆς. Ζεὺς ὄμβριος<sup>f</sup>—Ἐναστρος ὥστε Μαινάς<sup>g</sup>. Ἀχαιοὺς Ἀλφεισιβοία, ἀντὶ τοῦ ῤάς· τὰς γὰρ Βάκχας ὕδας ἔλεγον—ῤῆς<sup>h</sup>. ἐπίθετον Διοιύσου, ὡς Κλειδήμος... ἢ ὅτι ὕσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν γέννησιν αὐτοῦ—

Λοχενομένῳ δὲ Λυαίῳ  
πατρῆην ἐπέθηκεν ἐπωνυμίην τοκετοῖο,  
κυκλήσκων Διόνυσον, ἐπεὶ ποδὶ φύρτον αἰρίων  
ἦτε χωλαίων Κρονίδης βεβριθότι μηρῷ·  
νῦσος ὅτι γλώσση Συρακοσσίδι χολὸς ἀκούει i.

And though even in Greece many quarters, (Elis, Attica, Bœotia, Naxos, Teos,) disputed with each other the honour of having given him birth; yet common opinion placed the seat of his birth rather extra Græciam, at Nysa, or Nysos: and among the localities so called, at Nysos in India, or Nysa in Arabia: Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν λεγομένοις<sup>k</sup> καὶ ὁ ποιητῆς<sup>l</sup> ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις, λέγων περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητούντων τῆς τούτου γενέσεως, καὶ ἅμα τεκνωθῆναι παρεισάγων αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Ἀραβίαν Νύση.

Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνῳ<sup>m</sup> σ', οἱ δ' Ἰκάρῳ ἡνεμόσση φάσ', οἱ δ' ἐν Νάξῳ, Διὸν γένος, Εἰραφιῶτα, οἱ δὲ σ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινηέντι (κυσσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκείειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,) ἄλλοι δ' ἐν Θήβησιν, ἄναξ, σε λέγουσι γενέσθαι ψευδόμενοι. σὲ δ' ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε πολλὸν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, κρύπτων λευκώλενον Ἥρην. ἔστι δὲ τις Νύση, ὕπατον ὄρος, ἀνθέου ὕλη, τηλοῦ Φοινίκης, σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτιοιο ρόαων<sup>n</sup>.

· Ἐτεὸν γὰρ ἀνὰ χθόνα λύσατο κείνην  
Ζεὺς αὐτὸν Διόνυσον εὐρραφέος παρὰ μηροῦ<sup>o</sup>—

<sup>c</sup> Schol. in Iliad. Ξ. 325. Διόνυσον.

<sup>d</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> Etym. M. cf. Phot. Lex. ῤῆς: Suidas, ῤῆς.

<sup>i</sup> Nonnus, ix. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Diodorus, iii. 66.

<sup>l</sup> That is, Homer, (see iv. 2,) in

one of his Hymns: cf. Hymn. κς'. ver. i. Also Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1215, where the same passage is quoted as if from Herodotus, not from Homer.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Theocritus, Idyll. xxvi. 33.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. ad iii. 65.

<sup>o</sup> Dionysius Perieg. 939. De Arabia.

Νύσα δὲ τόπος τῆς Ἀραβίας, ἔνθα γεννᾶται ὁ Διόνυσος<sup>p</sup>—Νύσα καὶ Νυσηίου<sup>q</sup> ὄρος, οὐ καθ' ἓνα τόπον· ἔστι γὰρ Ἀραβίας, Αἰθιοπίας, Αἰγύπτου, Βαβυλῶνος, Ἐρυθρᾶς, Θράκης, Θετταλίας, Κιλικίας, Ἰνδικῆς, Λιβύης, Λυδίας, Μακεδονίας, Νάξου, περὶ τὸ Παγγαῖον, τόπος Συρίας—Νυσηίου<sup>r</sup>· τὴν λεγομένην Νύσαν. ὄρος δὲ λέγει τῆς Θράκης νῦν. ἐν ἄλλῳ Νυσηίου, ἢ Διονύσου διατριβῇ. ἢ δὲ Νύσα ἐν μέν τισι χώραις ὄρος, ὡς ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ καὶ Θράκῃ καὶ Ἀραβίᾳ καὶ Ἰνδικῇ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Νάξῳ. ὄρου δὲ πόλις· ὡς ἐν Καρίᾳ<sup>s</sup>, καὶ ἐν τῷ Καυκασίῳ ὄρει. ὄρου δὲ νῆσος· ὡς ἐν Νείλῳ ποταμῷ.

Dismissing therefore these purely imaginary explanations, we observe first of all that the oldest form of this word itself in the Greek appears to have been *Δεύνσος*: secondly, that if there was such a word as *Δεύνος*, not originally belonging to the Greek language, but borrowed from some other, it would necessarily become *Δεύνσος*, by the addition of the termination *ος*. Thirdly, that there was actually such a word as *Δεύνος*, though not in the Greek originally, yet in some other of the languages of antiquity, and especially in those of the east.

Δεύνσος· ὁ Διόνυσος. Ἀνακρέων

Πολλὰ δ' ἐριβρόμον

Δεύνσον—

τοῦ ι τραπέντος εἰς ε' γίνεται Δεόνυσος· οὕτω γὰρ Σάμιοι προφέροισι. καὶ συναίρεσει Δεύνσος·...ἐνιοὶ δὲ φασιν, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ ἐβασίλευσε Νύσης· κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰνδῶν φωνὴν Δεῦνος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγεται<sup>t</sup>—Διόνυσος<sup>v</sup> .. οἱ δὲ Δεόνυσον· ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς ἐγένετο Νύσης. Δεῦνον δὲ τὸν βασιλέα λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰνδοὶ, ὡς Ἰόβας..... ἢ ὅτι Διὸς υἱοῦτος ἐτέχθη ... ἢ παρὰ τὸ ... παρὰ γὰρ Ἡλείοις ὁ αὐτὸς τῷ ἡλίῳ νομιζέται, ἢ ἢ ὁ δαίμων, ὁ τοῦ δάου (ὅ ἐστι πυρὸς ἢ φωτὸς) αἴτιος—Νύσιος δὲ ὁ Διόνυσος τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς ὀνομάζεται, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Ἰνδοῖς Νύσης. οὐ μόνον δὲ Ἰνδοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατ' ἀκτῖνα ἔθνεσιν, ὡς φησι Φιλόστρατος<sup>x</sup>, ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Τυανέως βίῳ<sup>y</sup>—Οἱ δὲ Δεύνσος· ἐπεὶ βασιλεὺς Νύσης· (καὶ) Δεῦνον Ἀραβες τὸν βασιλέα (λέγουσι)<sup>z</sup>.

Now if there was really such a word as *δεύνος*, which did

<sup>p</sup> Schol. in Ranas, 218. Διὸς Διόνυσον.

<sup>q</sup> Hesychius. cf. in Νισηίου.

<sup>r</sup> Schol. in Iliad. Z. 133.

<sup>s</sup> Cf. our Origines Kalendarie Ita-

licæ, iv. 101 n.

<sup>t</sup> Etym. M.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid.

<sup>x</sup> ii. i. 56, 57.

<sup>y</sup> Scholia in Ranas, 218.

<sup>z</sup> Schol. in Iliad. E. 325. Διώνυσον.

not originally enter the Greek language, but was introduced into it from some of the languages of the east—and if the proper sense of this word in its own language was that of king; in these two facts we have all the explanation of the Greek *Διώνυσος*, which can be desired. Supposing only that the proper form of the word in its own language was *δευνvs*, not *δευρος*, and that its meaning in any case was that of king—as adopted into the Greek language, it would assume the form of *δεύνυσος*: and *δεύνυσος*, we see from the above testimonies, was one of the forms of this name, and apparently the first and oldest in use, among the Greeks. And as so adopted and so express it would carry with it the proper sense of *king*, at first, in the Greek, as much as in its own language. And as introduced with that signification, it would be more properly an appellative, in the Greek, than a proper name; denoting *the king*—the king *κατ' ἐξοχήν* indeed—but nothing more. And in such a title as that, applied to its proper subject, taken along with the fact that this subject must also have been the sun, we should have a strong confirmation of the truth of the etymon; because we know that such was the title, and such the style, under which and in which the nations of antiquity (particularly those of the east, from whom this name of *Δευνvs* was derived) were accustomed to speak of the sun and the moon, as the two supreme and ruling principles; of the one as the king, of the other as the queen, *κατ' ἐξοχήν* \*.

\* The Indian origin of the name of *Διώνυσος* may be illustrated by that of one of the commonest and best known of his titles, *Ελάν* or *Εύιος*, both which Lucretius applies to him at once,

Graditur simul Euius Euan<sup>1</sup>.

In explanation of these terms we should not hesitate to reject such glosses as the following<sup>2</sup>: *Εύιος και Εύσιος, ό Διώνυσος, και τó εις αυτόν επίφθεγμα, Εδσοι και Ελοί κατά Λίκωνας· Δωρικῆ γάρ διαλέκτῳ μεταγενεστέρῃ διὰ ένδειαν τοῦ σ φασί γεγενῆσθαι Εύιος και Εδοί και Ελάν.* Hesychius himself has one gloss, *Εδα· επευφημισμός ήλιακός (corrige ληναϊκός) και μυστικός . .* and another, *Εΰας· Διώνυσος*: both of which might have been derived from *Ελάν*. But he has another on *Ελάν· ό κισσός υπό 'Ινδών*: from which we learn that *Ελάν* was the Indian for *κισσός* in Greek, *hedera* in Latin, *ivy* in English: and as this shrub, next to the vine, was the

<sup>1</sup> Lib. v. 742.

<sup>2</sup> Etym. M.

SECTION V.—*On the Correction of the Primitive Calendar, and the introduction of the worship of Deunus and Duryha, in India, B. C. 1306.*

The result of our inquiries then, as far as they have yet proceeded, being *this*, That the name of the Hellenic Dionysos must have been ultimately derived from India, the first inference spontaneously suggested by that conclusion is, That the idea denoted by the name must have been derived from India also. If therefore, as we were told by Herodotus, the person who introduced both among the Greeks was Melampus, he too must have derived them from India. And if the time of Melampus, as we have endeavoured to prove, was the thirteenth century before Christ, (from B. C. 1297 downwards,) the introduction of the name and the worship of the Hellenic Dionysos among the Greeks, as originally due to him, could not have been older than the thirteenth century before Christ—but in India, from which he must have obtained both, it must have been older than the thirteenth century, before Christ, or at least, than the time of Melampus in that century.

Now it has been shewn in the first Part of these Origines of ours<sup>a</sup>, that in imitation of what the Egyptians had done 44 years before, when they conceived and proposed for the first time the idea of the two cosmogonic powers of their own system, Osiris and Isis, in their proper relation to each other, the ancient Hindoos also corrected their calendar B. C. 1306; and attached the head of the correction, as the Egyptians had done that of their Isiac calendar B. C. 1350, to the 17th of the Primitive Athyr. The history of this correction so made in India was traced in our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>b</sup>, first from Sept. 25, B. C. 1306, through three Periods of 120 years, (the proper Period of the Cyclico-Julian corrections of the primitive equable year,) to Sept. 25, B. C. 946, when the

most sacred to Dionysos of any, its name in the Indian language probably gave him his title of Euan—and very probably too the consecration of the shrub itself to Dionysos among the Greeks was due to the fact of its being known to have been consecrated to the Deunus of the Indians also.

<sup>a</sup> *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 1 sqq.

<sup>b</sup> *Loco citato*.

Lunar correction of this Cyclico-Julian calendar was first adopted in its stead, and the head of the calendar itself was advanced from Sept. 25 to Oct. 1; and then, from this second epoch of October 1, B. C. 946, to that of March 22, A. D. 538: to which the calendar was left attached; though it has not continued attached to it, but has gradually advanced upon it, in proportion to the collective amount of the annual difference of the mean sidereal year, according to the assumptions of the Hindoo astronomers, and the mean Julian, for the interval of time between.

This correction of the Indian calendar having been made in imitation of that of the Egyptian, and in connection *with* and subserviency *to* the very same ends and purposes; the introduction of objects of worship, and the institution of rites and ceremonies, analogous to those which had accompanied the Egyptian correction, B. C. 1350, must have attended this Indian one, B. C. 1306 also. The question is only, What these objects were? and by what name were they called? And though to the first of these questions, it would be obvious to answer, That if these objects of worship in India were really first conceived and introduced there in imitation of the Egyptian, they could not have differed from the Egyptian in anything but their names, we prefer to answer it, if possible, in a different way; and to get at the discovery of the proper objects of worship associated with the Hindoo correction, without going back to Egypt (at least in the first instance) to find them.

Now the first clue to this discovery is the fact, which we know of, from other sources, that Nature (*ἡ Φύσις*, treated as a person, and represented by a feminine principle, concerned in the production of all material and vegetable or animal nature,) has long had and still has a proper name among the Hindoos—which name is Durgha. It is still the traditionary doctrine of the Hindoos, that when the fatal moment, in the decursus of a never-ending duration, was come, the supreme principle in their system of theology, Brahma, awakened Durgha out of the state of insensibility and inactivity, called her sleep, in which her existence had previously been passed; and that this was the first step towards the origination of the present system of things.

Now, what was the Indian Durgha, thus represented, but the Egyptian Isis, or the Italian Pales, or the Hellenic Demeter, merely under a different name? It is clear then that if the Hindoos had among them from time immemorial an idea and a person like this, they had among them an Indian Isis, an Indian Pales, an Indian Demeter, from time immemorial also. And though it may be objected that on this principle, if the Indian Durgha was the Indian Isis, the Indian Brahma must have been the Indian Osiris, that is by no means a necessary inference from the modern Hindoo doctrine on these points; grafted some time or other on a much more ancient theory of the same kind. Nor does this modern doctrine do more than represent Durgha as merely awakened by Brahma into life and activity. It does not appear that the Hindoo Brahma was ever proposed as the proper masculine principle, coordinate with and correlative to the proper feminine one, in the first production of all things; and yet in the nature of things a feminine and a passive principle must both have required and implied a masculine and an active one: and if the Hindoo cosmogony had an Indian Isis from the first, it must have had an Indian Osiris also.

Again, it has been shewn in our *Fasti Catholicæ* that when the Hindoos, B. C. 946, adopted the Metonic instead of the Cyclico-Julian correction, they gave the months of their solar calendar the names which they still bear at the present day; and that the first of these months both in the preexisting Cyclico-Julian correction, and in the Metonic which was now taking its place, was the month called Kartika. And though the head of the calendar was advanced at this time from Sept. 25 to Oct. 1, no change was made either then, or ever after, in the order of the months, or in their relations to each other, in other respects; and there has always been a month in their solar calendar, called Kartika, and always at or about the same season of the natural or the Julian year, Oct. 1 to Nov. 1.

Again, it has also been shewn<sup>d</sup> that, as the civil calendar of the Hindoos from the date of this correction, B. C. 946, to the present day, has been and still is lunar as much as solar,

<sup>c</sup> iv. pag. 64 sqq.

<sup>d</sup> *Fasti Catholicæ*, iv. 31 sqq.

the Durgha month in this lunar calendar, (i. e. the month in which the festival of Durgha, the greatest and most splendid in the Hindoo calendar, has always been celebrated,) is the lunar Aswina; but the lunar Aswina, as still the same, *mutatis mutandis*, with the solar Kartika—to which the Durgha solemnity was originally attached B. C. 1306. And the rule of the celebration in the lunar calendar even at present is still the old Cyclico-Julian one, as first adapted to the original Cyclico-Julian correction, B. C. 1306, and then to the Metonic correction, substituted for it, B. C. 946<sup>e</sup>. The inference from these facts is not only that the idea and name and worship of the Indian Durgha must have been as old in India as the Cyclico-Julian correction, but also that the festival of Durgha, attached in the first instance to the 17th of the primitive Athyr, Æra Cyc. 2701, Sept. 25, B. C. 1306, *mutatis mutandis*, is still the same that it was at first.

Again, with respect to the meaning of this name of Durgha, that of the impersonation of nature in India, we have made inquiries concerning it of the best Sanskrit scholars at the present day; and we have been informed that there is such a word in the Sanskrit language, as genuine and as classical as any: a word compounded of two elements, *dur*, and *gha*; the former of which they explain to mean the same thing as the Greek *δυσ*, and the latter as the Greek *βαίρω* or *ὀδός*—so that both together in the Sanskrit denote much the same thing as *δύσοδος*, *δύσβατος*, or *δυσπρόσοδος* would in Greek.

On this principle, the meaning of this word in English would be that of “Difficult of access,” “Difficult of approach:” and that being the case, the first and most obvious objection to such an explanation of the name is this—That it is the least suitable *a priori* to such an idea and such a subject as must always have been intended by it, which could possibly have been imagined. For what was this idea but that of the Universal Mother and Nurse, the *Alma Mater* and *Alma Parens* of all things? And what consistency could there be in deriving the most appropriate designation of such an idea and such a subject from this property of difficulty of access? as if the common mother of all things could possibly be distinguished by a disposition and tendency so foreign to

<sup>e</sup> See *Fasti Catholici*, iv. page 37.

her nature, not to say her relations to external nature, as to forbid, to repress, to repel the approach of her own children.

It is clear then that though the Sanskrit language has retained this name of Durgha, it supplies no explanation of its meaning, except on the principle of a mere verbal coincidence between *dur* in the sense of *δύς*, and *gha* in the sense of *οδος*; and consequently between Durgha in composition, and *Δύσ-οδος* in composition also. Nor do we hesitate to say that this never could have been the meaning of the Durgha of a much earlier Hindoo antiquity, the Durgha of the correction of B. C. 1306—the Egyptian Isis under the name of Durgha. We must therefore endeavour to find, if possible, some more satisfactory explanation of it.

And here, as in other cases of like kind, a correction of the Primitive Calendar, made at a different time, and in a different quarter, and by a different person, comes in opportunely to throw light upon this Indian one, and to furnish the clue to the discovery of which we are in search; by making us acquainted with the Indian Durgha, under the same name, and yet at a distance from her own country. It is in our power to shew, (and if we are permitted to continue our inquiries to the time when it may be necessary to give some account of the Assyrian correction, we hope to shew,) that the celebrated Semiramis also was the author of a correction of the Primitive Calendar; the idea of which was derived from the Indian, and the first cause of which was due to her Indian expedition: a fact in her personal history which has been handed down concerning her, and the truth of which this correction itself does more to attest and confirm than anything else which is still on record.

The date of this correction was B. C. 1138—163 years later than the Hindoo one. We infer the fact of such a correction by Semiramis after her return from India, first, from the agreement between the date of this correction and the time assigned to Semiramis by history; so that if any such correction of the Primitive Assyrian Calendar was made at that time, it must have been made by her. Secondly, from the fact that as her Indian expedition lasted three years, she was long enough in the country to have become acquainted with the peculiar objects of worship among the Hindoos of this time, and with



their proper system of time, and the rule and administration of their calendar; and with the connection between the national calendar and the objects of the national worship. Thirdly, from the fact that Semiramis herself passed with posterity for the daughter of the goddess Derke or Derketo; the foundation of which tradition, in her case, as in others of like kind, was simply the fact that she introduced the worship of that goddess. Fourthly, from the fact that the proper name of this Assyrian goddess, whom the Syrians called Derke or Derketo, and the worship of whom was really introduced into Assyria by Semiramis, as it has been handed down through the Greeks, was Aderga or Adarga, Aterga or Atarga, Adergatis or Adargatis, Atergatis or Atargatis—all, it is evident, as well as that of Derke or Derketo, the same *inter se*, at bottom, and none of them different except *per accidens* from the Indian Durgha. We may safely therefore infer that the idea and name of the Assyrian Aderga must have been borrowed from those of the Indian Durgha; that the prototype of the former must have been the latter; and that Semiramis, having previously become acquainted with the conception of Durgha in India, transferred the name to one only accidentally different from it in Assyria.

It follows that whatsoever was denoted by the Assyrian Aderga, the same must have been denoted by the Indian Durgha; and though it would not be proper to digress at present, to produce and compare together the various statements of antiquity from which something like an idea of the nature of that conception, which went by this name among the Assyrians, might be formed—yet thus much we may venture to say, viz. That the Assyrian Aderga must have been recognised and proposed in the character of the *queen*, the queen *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; that her proper style and title was that of the queen, but her attributes, emblems, and characteristics in other respects, were those of the moon; those of the partner and correlative of the sun. It follows that such, in all probability, must have been the style and title of the Indian Durgha. That too in the Indian must have denoted the queen, and, in all probability, such a queen as the proper partner and comate of such a king as the sun; i. e. the moon.

And with the knowledge of this fact, thus discoverable through the proper meaning of the Assyrian Aderga, that the Indian Durgha, in all probability, denoted queen, along with the other, that the Indian Deunus, as a proper name, denoted a person who corresponded to the Hellenic Dionysos, and, as an appellative, denoted the king, we are placed at last in a situation to form a right idea of the nature of the Hindoo Correction, B. C. 1306; viz. that it must have been connected with the introduction, and subservient to the continuance, of the worship of two coordinate and correlative principles, each alike superior to every thing else, and distinguished between themselves only by the difference of sex. Consequently one a masculine, the other a feminine, conception of its kind; to the union of which was ascribed the production of all things, and to one of which was given the name of Deunus, or king, and to the other that of Durgha, or queen; the real objects in external nature, intended by these ideas and these names respectively, being the sun and the moon.

We have repeatedly had occasion to observe that this association of the sun and the moon, in this relation to each other, and to everything else, and under these names of the king and the queen absolutely, is characteristic of all the cosmogonies and all the theogonies of antiquity, especially of those of the East. According to Philostratus, quoted *supra*<sup>f</sup> by the scholia on the Iliad, the name of Νύσος, in the sense of Διόνυσος, was common, Πᾶσι τοῖς κατ' ἀκτῖα ἔθνεσιν: and though it would not have been true at any time, so far as we are aware, to say that all the oriental nations had a common name, even for a common conception, which they esteemed divine and sacred also, and that, the Greek Διόνυσος—it might have been, and it probably was, true, in the time of Philostratus, that all of them had a conception of this kind, (to which they gave the name of king,) only *per accidens* different from the Νύσος, or Διόνυσος, of the Greeks, in its first and proper sense.

<sup>f</sup> Page 82.

SECTION VI.—*On the quarter from which Melampus obtained his knowledge of the Indian Deumus.*

The name of the Hellenic Dionysos having been thus derived from that of the Indian Deumus, there can be no question that both the name, and the idea denoted by it, must ultimately have come from India. Now the testimony of Herodotus was express that, among the Greeks, the author of the worship of Dionysos was Melampus; and that must imply that he was the author of the name among them also. We are told too, if not by Herodotus, yet by Diodorus Siculus, and Clemens Alexandrinus, that Melampus brought both these things into Greece from Egypt. We must therefore endeavour to reconcile our own conclusions with each of these testimonies, by shewing how it may have been equally true, that the name and idea of the Hellenic Dionysos came ultimately from India, and yet that they were brought into Greece by Melampus from Egypt.

Egypt, at this period of the history of mankind, being the repository of all the knowledge handed down from the antediluvian to the postdiluvian world, and of all the additions made to it, from the second beginning of things downwards, it is superfluous to observe that it was the centre of attraction to the curious and inquisitive everywhere. Melampus indeed is the first of the Greeks of whom the fact, that he visited Egypt, is actually on record; but that fact being admitted, there can be no question concerning the motive which took *him* to Egypt, as it did Thales, and Solon, and CEnopides, and Pythagoras, and so many more of the Greeks, after him. And early as this visit of his may appear, in the history of such visits on the part of the Greeks in general, it was not earlier than the beginning of such an intercourse between Egypt and Greece as must already have diffused in that country some idea of the treasures of learning and science concealed in Egypt, and must have excited the curiosity of the intelligent and inquisitive among the Greeks, to become better acquainted with them. The colonies of Cadmus, of Danaus, of Erechtheus, and even of Minos, (all older than the acme of Melampus,) respectively, and especially that of Danaus, which settled at Argos, and from which the Prætidæ,

the contemporaries of Melampus, were lineally descended, are abundantly sufficient to account for the visit to Egypt, in the time of Melampus, of any Greek who was desirous of repairing to the fountain head of all the wisdom of his own day.

Now the principal city of Egypt in the time of Melampus was Thebes. The city of Memphis, which disputed the palm with Thebes, and even eclipsed it, in later times, was not in existence in the time of Melampus; having come into being only along with the worship of the Apis, and the institution of the Apis cycle, B. C. 973 s; whereas the antiquity of Thebes must have gone as far back as the time of the descent into Egypt<sup>h</sup>, and was little inferior to that of Zoan (Tanis) or On, (Heliopolis,) the only two cities of ancient Egypt which we know from the testimony of Scripture to have been actually older than the descent. No stranger then, who resorted to Egypt, attracted by its renown, and desirous of access to its stores of traditionary as well as acquired learning, could fail to visit Thebes. The populousness, magnitude, and wealth of this city, for which it was still famous among the Greeks in the time of Homer, three centuries and upwards later than Melampus, were probably at their acme in his time; and among the other causes which might have contributed to make it the principal city in Egypt, much must probably be attributed to the peculiarity of its situation, on the banks of the Nile, yet on the high road of the intercourse with Æthiopia on the one hand, and at a convenient distance for the intercourse with Arabia and India, along the shores of the Red Sea, on the other, whereby it would seem to have been designated as the centre of trade and commerce, between Egypt in general and those parts, in these times, as Alexandria was in after-times.

Of the fact of this intercourse between Thebes and India in particular, we produced a proof, of very high antiquity, though not so old as the time of Melampus<sup>i</sup>, in the Metonic correction of the primitive equable calendar, peculiar to the Thebaid, which must have been derived from that of the Hindoos, only 57 years after that had been made among

<sup>s</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 438 sqq.

<sup>h</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 242 sqq.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 217 sqq.

them in B. C. 946—and having been so introduced and established at Thebes, and among its dependencies, B. C. 889, continued in use in the same quarters much later than the beginning of the Christian era. There is no reason to suppose that an intercourse, which was still active and flourishing only three hundred years later than the time of Melampus, might not already have been begun before his time; and in that fact, (if it may only be assumed on the strength of its own probability,) we have the desired explanation of the phenomenon, into which we are inquiring, that of the derivation of the idea and name of the Grecian Dionysos, both from India and from Egypt. The truth must now appear to be, that they both came into Greece *from India through Egypt*. They were brought into Greece by Melampus from Egypt—they were found by Melampus at Thebes, in Egypt—and they came originally to Thebes from India. It is not necessary to suppose that if Melampus visited Thebes, in Egypt, he must also have proceeded as far as India; though such a supposition in itself is not impossible. It is sufficient to know that if he merely travelled as far as Thebes in upper Egypt, he might find there not only native Egyptians, but very possibly native Indians also, from whom he might learn both the name and the nature of the Indian Deunus. And though he must have become acquainted in Egypt also with the name and nature of the Egyptian Osiris, and if he did, could not have failed to perceive that there was no difference between the Egyptian Osiris and the Indian Deunus, except in name; it is no wonder that having to choose between two appellations, for his own conception of the same kind, (that of Osiris, which denoted the Son of the Egg<sup>k</sup>, and that of Deunus, which denoted the King,) he should have fixed upon the latter, and therefore brought back with him to Greece, in his own Διόνυσος or Δεύνυσος, not the name of the Egyptian Ὅσιρις, but that of the Indian Δεύνυς.

SECTION VII.—*On the probable motive to the introduction of the worship of Dionysos among the Greeks.*

In the passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, quoted *supra*<sup>1</sup>, it is observable that Melampus was spoken of as the author

<sup>k</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 165 sqq.

<sup>1</sup> Page 58.

not of the mysteries of Dionysos, but of those of Demeter. To understand this literally would contradict other and better testimonies; and be inconsistent with what we ourselves have shewn of the origin of the Eleusinia and of the Thesmophoria<sup>m</sup>. The question is then, In what sense may it be understood? without prejudice to the matter of fact and to the whole current of Grecian tradition, with respect to the origin of the mysteries of Demeter in particular.

In answer to this, we begin with reminding the reader of the testimony of Herodotus, to which we had repeated occasion to refer in the second Dissertation of this Part<sup>n</sup>; viz. That the daughters of Danaus taught the women of the country the Thesmophoria: from which we argued, that they taught them the Isia under the name of the Thesmophoria. Now it is very observable, that though Herodotus told us expressly that the daughters of Danaus taught the Argive women the services of Isis, he said nothing about their having taught them those of Osiris also; and yet it was to be expected *a priori* that Isis and Osiris, besides being necessarily connected with each other in the nature of things, would have been so associated in the apprehensions of all native Egyptians, that the idea of the one must have included that of the other, and neither could have been thought of, or mentioned, much less proposed as an object of worship, by native Egyptians at least, without the other.

Notwithstanding however this very natural presumption, we have no doubt that the case was, as the testimony of Herodotus, literally construed, implied it to have been; viz. That the daughters of Danaus did introduce into Argos the worship of Isis, but not that of Osiris: and we have no doubt also that the true explanation of this anomaly, if anomaly it is to be called, with respect to these Argive Thesmophoria of the daughters of Danaus, which admitted an Isis but not an Osiris, is that which we have already proposed<sup>o</sup>, to account for the same kind of inconsistency in the Thesmophoria of Eumolpus and Triptolemus, both of which admitted a Demeter, and a Korê, but neither of them an husband of the one, or a father of the other. The innocence and simplicity of

<sup>m</sup> Dissertation ii.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. supra, iv. page 304 sqq.  
v. 322 sqq.

these early times revolted from the open recognition of two such distinct principles as the masculine and the feminine agents in the work and effect of animal production: and the same sense of propriety, which induced the authors of the Eleusinia and of the Thesmophoria respectively to exclude from those institutions, as designed originally for the female sex. the emblem of the phallus, and every trace of anything but vegetable life in the cycle of production adumbrated thereby, caused the daughters of Danaus also to suppress the name and idea of the proper correlative of the Egyptian Isis, the type of the masculine and active principle in the cycle of production, as she was of the feminine and passive, in the Isia which they taught to the women of Argos.

With respect to the date of this coming of Danaus into Greece; it is a question on which we have never yet formally entered: and we shall find it convenient to postpone it still to a future opportunity. We may observe however that if, as we have hitherto assumed<sup>p</sup>, all these migrations from Egypt to Greece in particular, whether under Cadmus, or under Danaus, or under Erechtheus, or under Minos, besides those to any other quarter, as the Umbrian one to Italy, the Colchian one to the Pontus Euxinus, were ultimately due to one of the greatest, and longest, and most laborious of the undertakings of the ancient Egyptians, the excavation of the Lake of Mœris; none of them could have been earlier than the beginning of that undertaking—which we have seen reason to determine to the epoch of the first Sothiacal period, B. C. 1350<sup>q</sup>. Of these different colonies to Greece in particular, that under Cadmus appears to have been the earliest; and of the date of this we hope to speak by and by. Next to this, that under Danaus; which approached in fact so closely to the other, that probably there was only one year's difference between them.

Be this as it may; the fact of most importance to the present question is this, That several years before the time of Melampus the worship of the Egyptian Isis had been introduced into Argos, and by native Egyptians too—but not that of the Egyptian Osiris; and that, for anything which is known to the contrary, the Egyptian Isis had continued to

<sup>p</sup> See *supra*, Vol. iv. 42 sqq.

<sup>q</sup> See our *F. Catholici*, iii. 192 sqq.

be worshipped with proper rites and ceremonies, at Argos, from the time of the daughters of Danaus to the time of Melampus; but not the Egyptian Osiris. The Argive Hera was characteristic of that city from the first; and the æra of Argos was the æra of the priestesses of Hera from the first: and the Argive Hera was the Argive Isis from the first. In this state of the case then we have probably an explanation of the motive which induced Melampus to conceive the idea of introducing the worship of Dionysos at Argos also: and of the end which he proposed thereby. It might naturally have appeared to him that neither the Argive Isis, nor the Eleusian Demeter, as the impersonation and type of a cycle which, though taking its origin in the material and vegetable world, attained to its climax and consummation only in the animal and sensible, could be complete and perfect of its kind, without a corresponding masculine principle. An Isis for the vegetable world, without an Osiris, might be admissible; but an Isis for the animal one also, without an Osiris, would be an impossibility.

It is very conceivable therefore that the first motive to the act of Melampus might have been the conviction that the cycle of natural production and reproduction, adumbrated whether in the *Isia* or in the *Thesmophoria*, could not be restricted to the vegetable kingdom of nature; and if it must pass into the animal also, something was wanting in each of these institutions, constituted as they were in his time, to adapt them to this enlargement of their scope and comprehension respectively. And if he went to Egypt, in search of this desideratum, that was only to go to the fountain-head of each of these institutions themselves; where only, if any where, could they be found fully and entirely developed, and as true to their principles and assumptions in the practice and exemplification, as in the theory. Nor would it make any difference whether he had already been in Egypt before he conceived this idea of the reformation of the Argive *Isia*, or went there on purpose after he had formed it. Nor is it any objection, as we have already observed, that the masculine principle, which he actually associated with the Argive Isis at last, was not the Egyptian Osiris, but the Indian *Deonus*—; if there was no difference between the Osiris of



the Egyptians and the Deumus of the Indians except in name—and if the name of Deumus, on many accounts, for such an institution as that of his Dionysia, and for such an idea as that of his Dionysos, was preferable to that of Osiris, or, as Osiris in his time was still called in Egypt, Suiris<sup>r</sup>.

We will therefore assume that the moving cause to this correction of the Argive Isia or Thesmophoria by Melampus was the want of a masculine principle in the symbolical representation thereof in his time, to correspond to the feminine which actually entered it. On this assumption, it is easy to see that there might have been a foundation even for the statement, referred to supra, from Clemens Alexandrinus; that Melampus brought the mysteries of Demeter from Egypt. He brought *that* from Egypt, and associated it with the mysteries of Demeter, which was necessary to their integrity, and to make them the same thing in practice which they were in theory. And it is a still stronger and more striking confirmation of our conclusion, that Melampus must have been the first who associated both the masculine and the feminine principle in the mystical cycle of his own time, that Melampus also, according to testimony, was the first who introduced among the Greeks the mystical symbol of the relation of these two principles to each other, in the shape of the Phallus—before carefully excluded both from the Argive Isia and from the Eleusinian Thesmophoria<sup>s</sup>. Of this however more will require to be said by and by.

SECTION VIII.—*On the probable date of the introduction of the name and worship of Dionysos; and of the Correction of the Primitive calendar which accompanied it.*

With respect then to the time of this introduction of the name and the worship of the Hellenic Dionysos—if Melampus himself was not born before B. C. 1297, it could not have been older than B. C. 1297: and if he lived to be sixty or seventy years of age, it might have been as late as B. C. 1230, when he could not have been more than sixty-seven years of age at the utmost.

But before we can come to any conclusion on this ques-

<sup>r</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 170 sqq.

<sup>s</sup> See Vol. iv. 309.

tion, it is very necessary to take into account a well known fact in the traditionary history of the Dionysos of the Greeks, to which we adverted generally *supra* <sup>t</sup>—his Indian expedition, his conquest of that country, and his triumphal return to Greece. In every account of this fable, his invasion and subjugation of India are represented not only as prior, but also as preliminary, to the recognition of himself as divine, in Greece. The final end of the conquest itself, followed by the return in triumph, is declared by the effect, which in every account of the fable is supposed to have ensued upon it; the recognition of the divinity of Dionysos first indeed at Thebes, where he himself was born, and then, with little or no delay, everywhere else in Greece.

Now, with respect to the first idea of such a fable as this; if the name and worship even of the Hellenic Dionysos did really come from India, as much as from Egypt, it is manifest it had a foundation in the matter of fact; and if it implied no more than simply that Dionysos had been acknowledged in India before he was so in Greece, or even that his recognition in Greece followed with little or no delay on his recognition in India, it would have implied nothing which was not agreeable to the actual course of things. Nor can there be any doubt, in our opinion, whether this popular fable of the conquest of India by the Theban Dionysos, and of his triumphal return from India to Thebes, followed by the confession of his divinity everywhere among his countrymen the Greeks, must not have been sometime or other grafted on the simple historical fact, which our own inquiries have just brought to light, that the first idea of the Hellenic Dionysos, and in particular the name, was derived from India.

With respect then to this part of the traditionary history of the Hellenic Dionysos; we may observe that Nonnus indeed, the author of the *Dionysiaca*, has made this Indian expedition the subject of his epic poem, in 48 books; and for that reason, in all probability, contrary to the uniform tradition of antiquity, has supposed it to have lasted seven years. Tradition represented it to have lasted only three; and it founded on that coincidence the rule of the *Dionysia*,

in the sense of the Orgies, themselves—as a cycle of three years, a τριετηρίς: Τὸν δ' οὖν Διόνυσόν φασι, says Diodorus<sup>v</sup>, κολάσαντα μὲν τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἐπιεικῶς δὲ προσενεχθέντα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις, ἐκ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἐπ' ἐλέφαντος τὴν εἰς Θήβας ἐπάνοδον ποιήσασθαι τριετοῦς δὲ διαγεγενημένου τοῦ σύμπατος χρόνου, φασὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς αἰτίας ἄγειν τὰς τριετηρίδας. And again<sup>x</sup>: Στρατεύσαντα δ' εἰς τὴν Ἰνδικὴν τριετὲ χρόνῳ τὴν ἐπάνοδον εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ποιήσασθαι, κομίζοντα μὲν λαφύρων ἀξιολόγων πλῆθος· καταγαγεῖν δὲ πρῶτον τῶν ἀπάντων θρίαμβον ἐπ' ἐλέφαντος Ἰνδικοῦ. καὶ τοὺς μὲν Βοιωτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας, καὶ Θρᾶκας, ἀπομνημονεύοντας τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἰνδικὴν στρατείας, καταδειξάει τὰς τριετηρίδας θυσίας Διονύσῳ, καὶ τὸν θεὸν νομίζειν κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ποιεῖσθαι τὰς παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιφανείας. διὸ καὶ παρὰ πολλαῖς τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων διὰ τριῶν ἐτῶν βακχεῖά τε γυναικῶν ἀθροῖζεσθαι κ', τ. λγ.

The final end of this expedition, and of this return from it in triumph, as we have observed, was the acknowledgment of the divinity of Dionysos by the whole of Greece; and the time of the return, according to the fable, followed by that effect, synchronised so critically with that fact in the history of Theseus, which we considered supra<sup>z</sup>, his return from Crete after his mission with the *δασμὸς*, that Ariadne, just abandoned in Dia by him, was supposed to have been found there by Dionysos, just returning from the east. So that on this principle there was little or no interval between the desertion of Ariadne by Theseus and her discovery by Dionysos: and in some accounts (as for example Diodorus's<sup>a</sup>) the arrival of both at Naxos (Theseus' on his way home, and Dionysos' on his return from India) coincided so critically, that Ariadne was not found abandoned there by Theseus, but forcibly taken from him there by Dionysos himself.

Now, though this history of the Theban Dionysos, and of his Indian expedition, was purely imaginary, the mission of Theseus to Crete, and his marriage to Ariadne, were not fabulous. How then shall we account for such a critical coincidence between this one circumstance of a merely fictitious and fabulous story and an actual matter of fact? This fable of

<sup>v</sup> iii. 65.

<sup>x</sup> iv. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* ii. 2. 115. *Apoll. Biblioth.* iii. v. 1. cf. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Vol. iv. page 525.

<sup>a</sup> iv. 61.

the Theban Dionysos and of his adventures in India was no doubt the invention of the later poets; and the historical groundwork of the fable in general, and of this one of its circumstances in particular, was probably this, That the name and worship of Dionysos, as originally derived from those of the Indian Deunus, having been introduced into the Peloponnese by Melampus, *three* years before the return of Theseus from his mission to Crete, were generally received and acknowledged in the rest of Greece, or in Bœotia and Attica in particular, about the time of *that* return.

On this foundation, which in itself was a simple historical coincidence between two totally different and unconnected events, it would be easy to build such a superstructure as that of the fabulous conquest of India by the same Dionysos, whose name and nature as divine, however generally received among the Greeks, still came ultimately from India—of his triumphal return from that conquest to Greece, in order to receive the homage due to his divinity, as attested and sealed by that conquest—and of the coincidence of the return, followed by this recognition, with a memorable epoch in Attic history in particular, the return of Theseus from his mission to Crete. If then we know the true date of that return, we know the date of the first introduction of the name and worship of Dionysos at Argos, three years before; and the former having been already determined to B. C. 1227<sup>b</sup>, the latter is thereby determined to B. C. 1230.

This point therefore being so far settled—with respect to the remaining question, that of the correction of the Primitive calendar which Melampus associated with the introduction of the name and the worship of his Dionysos; we must begin with referring again to the testimony of Diodorus quoted once before, *supra* <sup>c</sup>: Μελάμποδα δέ φασι μετενεγκεῖν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὰ Διονύσῳ νομιζόμενα τελεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι, καὶ τὰ περὶ Κρόνου μυθολογούμενα, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς Τιτανομαχίας, καὶ τὸ σύνολον τῆν περὶ τὰ πάθη τῶν θεῶν ἱστορίαν<sup>d</sup>. It is clear from this that tradition attributed *three* things to Melampus, the first introduction of the rites of Dionysos as ordinarily celebrated among the Greeks; the fabulous history of Cro-

<sup>b</sup> See Vol. iv. 522 sqq.

<sup>c</sup> Page 58.

<sup>d</sup> Diodorus, i. 97.

nos; and the *Τιταρομαχία*: all too as brought by him from Egypt, and apparently brought at once.

Now in what sense could that be true of all these things alike? The rites of Dionysos, it is to be presumed, must have meant one thing, the fable of Cronos another, and the *Τιταρομαχία* something different from both. And though Diodorus enters into no further explanations on any of these points, yet we may presume he must have meant by the fable of Cronos in particular, here ascribed in its origin to Melampus, the same in general which we still read in the *Theogonia* of Hesiod; and by the *Τιταρομαχία*, the same battle of the Titans and the Olympic gods which is still to be read there too. On this principle, the first author of each of these fables, as known to the Greeks, as well as of the rites of Dionysos, as practised among the Greeks, must have been Melampus; and all must have been brought into Greece by Melampus from Egypt, and all at once.

With respect to that one of these assertions, which attributes the introduction of the name and worship of the Hellenic Dionysos, and yet as derived from Egypt, to Melampus, we have said enough already to shew that there was good foundation for it in the matter of fact. With respect to the other two, that he brought the fable of Cronos and Uranus, and the fable of the battle of the gods and the Titans, from Egypt also, and at the same time too; the proper explanation of these assertions is to be found, first, in the connection of these two fables with each other, which was such that they must be considered only as successive parts of one and the same history; secondly, in the derivation of the second of these fables, that of the *Τιταρομαχία*, from Egypt also, as much as the name and the worship of Dionysos. It was shewn, when we were considering that fable in particular<sup>e</sup>, that these Titans, under their chief Cronos, were the representatives as well as the champions of equable time; the gods of Olympus, under the leadership of Zeus, were the impersonation as well as the asserters of Julian, in contradistinction to equable: that these Titans themselves derived their name from the Egyptian Tati, or Thoth, the impersonation of equable solar time in Egypt, and they were each of them so

<sup>e</sup> Vol. iv. 527 sqq.

many Tatis, or Thoths, also; and that the final end of the fable itself, the secret meaning of the whole of this imaginary contest between the two systems of time, the equable and the Julian, in the abstract, was simply to explain and account for the fact that a correction of the Primitive calendar, by the substitution of the Julian for the equable principle of reckoning, which should have been made ten years before, and attached to the 17th of Athyr, was made *de facto* ten years later, and attached to the 19th of Athyr.

Now Melampus, if really born about B. C. 1297, must have been contemporary with the correction of Minos, B. C. 1260, when the Julian principle, in the shape of the octaëteric cycle, was first introduced into the primitive civil calendar of the Greeks. It is manifest therefore that neither his time, nor the facts of his personal history, as far as anything is known of them at present, nor any condition of the true authorship of such a fable as this, implied in its own suppositions, would be inapplicable *a priori* to its supposed invention by Melampus; and that, as tradition among the Greeks appears to have handed his name down as that of its author, so it could not have handed down the name of any one more likely *a priori* to have been its author.

It is manifest that if this fable recognised Æra Cyc. 2737, B. C. 1270, as the time when a correction like that of Minos ought to have been made, in order to be attached to the 17th of Athyr, and Æra Cyc. 2747, B. C. 1260, as that when it was actually made and attached to the 19th, it could not have been older than B. C. 1260; and unless it could be considered probable that an ingenious allegory like this, founded upon the fact of the correction, would be imagined and made public as soon as the correction itself, there can be no objection *a priori* to the supposition that, even if the work of Melampus, it was not invented before the introduction of the name and worship of his Dionysos, and the institution of his Dionysia, with which Diodorus also appears to make it synchronous.

Now it is clearly inferrible from this fable, if we have explained it rightly, that in the opinion of its author, the derivation of a Julian calendar from the preexisting equable one, attached in the first instance to the 17th of the primitive

Athyr, would have been no irregularity, no novelty; but the derivation of a Julian correction from the equable calendar, attached to any other equable date, instead of the 17th, (like the 19th of Athyr, to which that of Minos was *de facto* attached,) was an anomaly, was an innovation, contrary to rule and precedent; to obviate which, and to prevent its becoming the law and the practice in future corrections of the same kind, was the sole object of the long and furious resistance of the Titans, or Thoths, the representatives and propugnators of equable, in contradistinction to Julian, time.

We may infer then, from the state of the case in the fable of this author's own invention, that he was aware of the rule, founded on the example of the Egyptians, at the time of the introduction of the worship of their Osiris and Isis, B. C. 1350, which had consecrated the 17th of the primitive Athyr as the stated epoch of Julian corrections, derived from the equable calendar indeed, but intended for the regulation of rites and ceremonies, in honour of such objects of worship as the Egyptian Osiris and Isis; and that he was not only aware of it, but approved of it, and must have considered no term in the equable calendar so proper for an use and purpose of that kind as the 17th of the third month. It may therefore be taken for granted, that if Melampus was both the author of this Titanomachia, and the author of a correction of the primitive calendar, simultaneous with the introduction of the worship of his own Dionysos, and subservient to it, it must have been attached by him to the 17th of the primitive Athyr.

And as there were two forms of these Julian corrections, either of which might be derived in this manner from the equable calendar, the simple Julian, with a cycle of four years, and the cyclico-Julian<sup>f</sup>, with a cycle of 120 years, it is easy to see which of the two the author of such a fable as this was most likely to prefer; the simple Julian, which had nothing in common with the equable calendar, except the epoch of its own origination, borrowed from it at first, or the cyclico-Julian, which though Julian in principle as much as the other at all times, and at stated times Julian in practice and administration, yet to all appearance continued to be

<sup>f</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, i. 549 sqq. : 555 sqq.

equable, after the correction, as much as before. In answer therefore to the question, what kind of correction of the primitive calendar Melampus would probably think of making for the sake of his own Dionysia, we may venture to say it would be the cyclico-Julian; and in answer to the further question, what would be the proper Julian epoch of such a correction, we may likewise undertake to say, it would be that Julian term which in the year of the institution of his Dionysia corresponded to Athyr 17. The year of the institution therefore having been already determined on probable grounds to B. C. 1230, all we have to do, in order to discover the epoch of his correction, is to ascertain the Julian term on which Athyr 17 was falling B. C. 1230.

Now B. C. 1230 corresponded to *Æra Cyc.* 2777; and in that year of the *Æra Cyclica*, the first of the primitive Thoth, reckoned by the Julian rule from midnight, as our General Tables shew, was falling June 23 at midnight; the first of the primitive Phaophi, July 23 at midnight; and the first of the primitive Athyr, August 22 at midnight: and consequently the 17th, on September 7 at midnight. This therefore, if we are right in our reasonings and conclusions hitherto, must have been the Julian date of the Dionysian correction of Melampus, Athyr 17, *Æra Cyclica* 2777, Sept. 7, B. C. 1230. It is the natural result of our preceding reasonings; and we shall find it confirmed by fresh proofs hereafter\*.

\* The date of the introduction of the worship of the Dionysos of Melampus being thus determined to B. C. 1230; we may observe that it was just eight years, or one Octaëteric cycle, older than the introduction of that of the Pythian Apollo by Philammon of Delphi, B. C. 1222. The proper services of the latter were attached to, and celebrated by, an Octaëteric cycle attached to August 26. And this was so near to the stated date of those of Dionysos, Sept. 7, that both would often be going on together—which was probably the reason, as much as any thing else, why mount Parnassus, though properly sacred to Apollo, yet from a very early period appears to have been considered sacred to Dionysos also; to which no doubt the peculiarity of the mountain itself, in having a summit with two peaks, would contribute also.

Mons ibi verticibus petit arduus astra duobus,  
Nomine Parnassus, superatque cacumine nubes.

Ovid. *Metam.* i. 316.

Macrobius, *Saturn.* i. 18: Item Bœotii Parnasum montem Apollini



This then having been the Julian date of the correction, and the correction itself one of that kind to which we have given the name of Cyclico-Julian, as combining the character and appearance of the equable reckoning externally with the Julian in reality, it would proceed from this time forward, (Sept. 7, B. C. 1230, Athyr 17, Æra Cyc. 2777,) in the Period of 120 years; the Julian epoch, from Period to Period, continuing the same in terms as at first, the equable varying from Period to Period, in proportion to the recession of equable cyclical time in Julian, from Period to Period also.

SECTION IX.—*Scheme of the Cyclico-Julian Correction, or Dionysian Calendar, of Melampus, in the Period of 120 Julian and 120 Equable years respectively, from B.C. 1230 to B.C. 510.*

Epoch, Athyr 17, Æra Cyclica 2777  
Sept. 7, B. C. 1230

Period.	Midn.		Æra Cyc.	Midn.	B. C.
i.	Athyr	17	2777	Sept. 7	1230
ii.	Chœac	16	2897	Sept. 7	1110
iii.	Tybi	16 = 15	3017	Sept. 7	990
iv.	Mecheir	15 = 14	3137	Sept. 7	870
v.	Phamenoth	14 = 13	3257	Sept. 7	750
vi.	Pharmuthi	12	3377	Sept. 7	630
vii.	Pachon	11	3497	Sept. 7	511 = 510

sacratum esse memorantes, simul tamen in eodem et oraculum Delphicum et speluncas Bacchicas uni Deo consecratas colunt. unde et Apollini et Libero patri in eodem monte res divina celebratur. Nonnus, xiii. 129—

Ἐπεὶ Δαφναῖος Ἀπόλλων  
κλήρον ἔδον ξύνωσε κασιγνητῷ Διονύσῳ,  
Παρνησσὸν δικάρηνον—

Ibid. xxvii. 255. ubi Jupiter loquitur. cf. 250.

Ἄμπελος οὐ σε λέληθεν ἐφήμερος· οἶσθα καὶ αὐτὴν  
ἀμφοτέρων σκοπέλων διδυμάονα μυστίδα πεύκην,  
ἀλλὰ κασιγνητοῖο τεοῦ προμάχιζε Λυαίου,

.. ..  
Παρνησοῦ δὲ γέραιρε τεῖν ξυνήονα πέτρην,  
ὅππότε κωμάζουσα χοροῖτύπος ἴαχε Βάκχη,  
σοὶ μέλος ἐντύνουσα καὶ ἀγρύπνῳ Διονύσῳ,  
Δελφικὸν ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμόζυγον ἀψαμένη πῦρ.

The ingress of the vith Period, it is evident, would anticipate 37 years on the archonship of Solon, B. C. 593, and 38 years on his correction, B. C. 592; and in those 37 or 38 years, the recession of Pharmuthi 12, on Sept. 7, would amount to ten days exactly; and Pharmuthi 12, which Æra Cyclica 3377 was falling on Sept. 7, B.C. 630, Æra Cyc. 3414 would be falling on August 28, B. C. 593, and Æra Cyclica 3415 on August 28, B. C. 592. For B. C. 593 being a leap-year in the Julian reckoning of the Æra Vulgaris before Christ, with the exception of the dates of the first two months, the scheme of the equable calendar, in terms of the Julian, would be the same, Æra Cyc. 3414, B. C. 593, and Æra Cyc. 3415, B. C. 592.

*Scheme of the Primitive Equable Calendar, Æra Cyc. 3414 and 3415, in terms of the Julian, for the first eight months.*

Æra Cyc.	B. C.	Æra Cyc.	B. C.
3414	593	3415	592
Month.		Month.	
i. Thoth	Jan. 20	i. Thoth	Jan. 19
ii. Phaophi	Feb. 19	ii. Phaophi	Feb. 18
<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> Æra Cyc. 3414—3415 B. C. 593—592			
Month.		Month.	
iii. Athyr	March 20	vi. Mecheir	June 18
iv. Chœac	April 19	vii. Phamenoth	July 18
v. Tybi	May 19	viii. Pharmuthi	Aug. 17
<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> Pharmuthi 12 August 28			

SECTION X.—*On the transfer of the Dionysia of Melampus from the 12th of the 8th month in the Primitive Calendar, B. C. 592, to the 12th of the second in the Correction of Solon.*

From the account of the name and nature of the Dionysos of Melampus, which has thus been given, it is evident that nothing could have been originally intended by it, except the masculine principle in the cycle of production in general; or, if a distinction requires to be drawn between the vege-

table cycle of that kind and the animal one, with a closer relation to the latter than to the former. It is clear at least that the Dionysos of Melampus, in the idea and apprehension of its own author, could have had no exclusive relation to any one kind of vegetable production in particular, nor could possibly have been conceived and proposed at first, in the character of the Dionysos of later times, the impersonation of the vine, or of the fruit of the vine. And though the correction of the calendar, which accompanied the institution of the Dionysia, was certainly attached to Sept. 7, and September 7, even at this period of the history of time, might not have been more than a month too early for the vintage season in Greece. it cannot be doubted that this coincidence was merely *per accidens*, and due to the circumstance that the 17th of the Primitive Athyr at the same point of time happened to be falling on the Julian Sept. 7. The same reason which induced Melampus, B. C. 1230, to attach his correction to Sept. 7, would have induced him, B. C. 1306, as it did the Hindoos, to attach it to Sept. 25, and without any express regard to the season of the vintage, B. C. 1306, any more than B. C. 1230; though Sept. 25 would have been much nearer to the stated date of that season, for the climate of Greece, B. C. 1306, than Sept. 7, B. C. 1230.

It is manifest therefore, that the connection, which must sometime or other have been established between the Dionysia, in the sense of the rites and services of Dionysos, and the Dionysia, in the sense of the vintage festivities, in its origin must have been accidental. And though it may be difficult at present to account for it satisfactorily, yet, if the truth on this point had been handed down by testimony, we are of opinion, it would be found to have arisen in fact out of the coincidence of the Eleusinia or the Thesmophoria with the vintage season, before the Dionysia, and out of the transition of the Dionysia, some time or other, into the Eleusinia. For both of these were older institutions than the Dionysia; and each was attached from the first to a Julian date, Sept. 25— which, even at the time of their institution, would have been as proper and suitable for the beginning of ingathering or vintage, as any that could have been selected. Nor after the institution of these two solemnities could it fail to hap-

pen, that their proper ceremonies and the vintage festivities every year would be beginning and proceeding together. If then the Dionysia of Melampus had been instituted along with them at first, or, though instituted before them both, had been subsequently incorporated with them, nothing would have been easier than to explain the connection between the Dionysia, in the sense of the Orgies, and the Dionysia in the sense of the vintage festivities; or the popular idea and apprehension of the nature and relations of the Dionysos of those ceremonies himself, as the impersonation of the fruit of the vine, which must have grown up in the course of time out of this coincidence.

The history indeed of the Dionysia of Melampus, from B. C. 1230 downwards, is obscure and uncertain, but only because of the defect of testimony. We may observe however that both the Eleusinia and the Dionysia having come into existence within 80 years of each other—both having been attached to the same season of the natural year—both to the same month in the Julian, if not to the same day of the month—and one of them being professedly devoted to the feminine, the other to the masculine, principle, in a cycle of production, *communis generis*—either was predisposed to coalesce with the other; and it might easily come to appear necessary to the common end and effect, proposed by each, that they should be incorporated one with the other. The Demeter of Eumolpus could not be complete without the Dionysos of Melampus; nor *vice versa*, the Dionysos of Melampus without the Demeter of Eumolpus. And as the fact is certain that the masculine principle, though not originally recognised in the institution of Eumolpus, did ultimately get admission into it; it seems on every account most reasonable to suppose it must have done so, under the influence of some such conviction as this, that the masculine principle was a desideratum in the original institution, and must be supplied *ab extra*, from some other source. And as nothing of this kind could have been done among the Greeks anywhere at random, so among the Athenians in particular it was never so likely to have been done advisedly, and with the requisite degree of authority, as B. C. 593, when Solon was archon, and not only remodelling the constitution of the Athenians in general, but

correcting the calendar in particular, and in subserviency to that making very important changes in the long-established rule even of the Eleusinia and the Thesmophoria themselves; of which we have given an account in the second Dissertation of this Part  $\S$ . It would be nothing extraordinary if, at the same time, he made another innovation in the old rule of the Eleusinian institution, which, though a still greater departure from the principles and assumptions of its proper author, might appear to be required by the reason of things, and the change of circumstances,—that of adopting the Dionysos of Melampus into the society of the Demeter of Eumolpus, but in the form of the Ἰακχος, or Διόνυσος ἐπὶ μαστῶ—the type and impersonation of infant animal life, as the Korê was of that of vegetable.

As then, in tracing the Dionysia from the time of Melampus to the time of Solon, we have to explain, if possible, two facts, each of them connected with the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις—(the Διονύσια λίμναια, ἐπὶ λίμνῶ, or Ἀνθεστήρια) in particular—one, why these, from the time of Solon downwards, should have passed for the oldest of their kind—the other, why these, from the time of Solon downwards, should have been attached to the 12th of the second month in his calendar—With respect to the first; we account for it at once, if we suppose these Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις to have been first instituted, and by Solon, B. C. 592, and none else, at that time, besides; and none but these for a long time after to have been actually in existence among the Athenians. It is no objection to this supposition, that Thucydides calls them the ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια even in the Ionic, as well as in the Attic, ritual of his own day: for there was no difference at first between the Ionic correction and the correction of Solon. And as to the ritual, or liturgic, year of both, the influence of Solon, which effected these changes at Athens, at the time of his correction, for some reason or other, seems to have extended to Ionia, and to the adoption of the same rules and regulations, in numberless instances, there also.

With respect to the second; we account for that too, if we suppose that when Solon adopted the Διόνυσος of Melampus into the mysteries, under the name of the mystical Ἰακχος, he

$\S$  See Vol. iv. page 239 sqq. and page 278 sqq.

set back the Dionysia, as before observed according to their original rule, from the 12th of Pharmuthi, on which they were falling B. C. 593 or B. C. 592, to the 12th of Phaophi; or, in terms of his own correction, from the 12th of his Metageitnion to the 12th of his Anthesterion. And this will explain another peculiarity of the rule of these *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*—that they had two days assigned them, in the correction of Solon, the 12th and 13th, of the proper month; and not merely one. The correction of Solon was derived from the Primitive Calendar; and in the year of the correction, the first of Gamelion, Cycle i. 1 of his calendar, and the first of Thoth, *Æra Cyc.* 3415, were absolutely the same, and both with Jan. 19, B. C. 592. But the first of his Anthesterion the same year anticipated one day on the first of Phaophi; Feb. 17 instead of Feb. 18: the consequence of which would be, that the 12th of Pharmuthi, set back to the 12th of Phaophi the same year, would be set back to March 1: the 12th of Metageitnion, set back to the 12th of Anthesterion, would be set back to Feb. 28. The Dionysia of Solon were consequently attached to both; both to the 12th of Anthesterion, Feb. 28, and to the 13th, March 1: to the former under the name of the *Χόες*, and to the latter under that of the *Χύτροι*.

And these two appear to have been *de facto* the proper dates of the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*, in his calendar, ever after. For though there was another date, that of the *Πιθολύγια*, attached to the 11th of the month, which, along with the *Χόες* and the *Χύτροι*, made up the *Λήναια* in general, and is commonly reckoned one of the component parts of the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*, this connection seems to have grown up only in the course of time, and to have been accidental originally. For this particular ceremony of the *Πιθολύγια* appears to have been more œconomic than Dionysian; and to have been attached to the 11th of Anthesterion for a reason more connected with the ordinary business of domestic life and household management, than any of the services of religion<sup>h</sup>. But the Dionysia in the sense of the scenic representations seem to have begun properly on the *Χόες*, the 12th, not the 11th, of the month. And though the annual archonship had long

<sup>h</sup> Cf. Vol. ii. 723 sqq.

been in existence in the time of Solon, and he might, had he pleased, have assigned the care and superintendence of these Dionysia to the archon Eponymus; it is to be considered that, as representing the original Dionysia of Melampus, and possibly as old, among the ancient observances of the Athenians, as the time of Theseus himself, the contemporary of Melampus<sup>i</sup>, they would appear to belong more properly to the jurisdiction of the Ἄρχων Βασιλεύς—the representative of the ancient kings of Athens, in name, even in Solon's time.

It may however be objected to this account of the probable institution of the Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις, that, as there were only five periods of 120 years between the time of Melampus and that of Solon, it was to be expected *a priori* he would go back only five months, from the proper date of the Dionysia of Melampus in his own correction; and therefore from the 12th of Metageitnion, B. C. 592, to the 12th of Elaphebolion, not to the 12th of Anthesterion. But it should be recollected, as we saw supra<sup>k</sup>, that there was a preexisting ceremony among the Athenians, much older than his correction, under the name of the Χόες—which tradition derived from the time of Orestes—and the stated date of which, as transmitted from that time to his, was the second month of the Primitive Calendar, represented in his correction by the month Anthesterion. It was probably for the sake of this that Solon went back one month further than might otherwise seem to have been necessary, to find the proper term in his own correction, to which he should attach his Dionysia. It is certain that these were attached *de facto* to the 12th of the second month in his calendar, under the name of the Χόες: and it is certain also, that the Χόες was the name of the ceremony, older than his Dionysia, the origin of which tradition carried back to the time of Orestes.

And yet this apparent anomaly, in carrying back the date of the Dionysia from the 12th of Pharmuthi to the 12th of Phaophi, instead of the 12th of Athyr, Æra Cyc. 3415, or from the 12th of Metageitnion to the 12th of Anthesterion, instead of the 12th of Elaphebolion, cycle i. 1, of the correction, or from August 28 to Feb. 28, instead of March 30, B. C. 592, might have something to do with the institution of the Dionysia ἐν ἄστει, and the determination of their proper

<sup>i</sup> Cf. Vol. iv. page 507 sqq. cf. supra, 29.

<sup>k</sup> Page 31 sqq.

date, at the time of their institution. It is far from improbable that as the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*, the first and oldest of all, had been instituted by Solon, soon after the beginning of the sixth period of Melampus, so the next in antiquity to these, the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει*, might be instituted at the beginning of the seventh, B. C. 510; and as the former had been attached at *that* time to the 12th of the second month, so might the latter be attached at *this*, to the 12th of the third\*. B. C. 510 is another important epoch in the history of changes in the laws and constitutions of the Athenians; being the commonly received date of the alterations made by Cleisthenes, the next great reformer and legislator after Solon. The institution of the *Διονύσια ἐν ἄστει* was very probably one of these. On this supposition, we should account for the name given to these in particular; that of the *Διονύσια μεγάλη*, or *Διονύσια ἄπλωσ*, though so much later than the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις*—because they were the representative of the original *Διονύσια* of Melampus; and why they should have been committed to the *Ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος*, not merely because the *Διονύσια ἐν Λίμναις* had been assigned to the *Ἄρχων βασιλεὺς*, but because the *Ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος* was the principal Archon, and these *Διονύσια* were the principal Dionysia.

That all this was actually done, B. C. 510, or about that time, we do not indeed know from testimony; but neither do we know that it was not. The earliest allusion to these Dionysia, as already in existence at Athens, is that which occurs in Herodotus<sup>1</sup>, to the representation of the *Μιλήτου ἄλωσις* of Phrynichus, in the *theatre*; for that implies, *at* these Dionysia: and this, as we observed *supra*<sup>m</sup>, could not have been much later than B. C. 494. And having thus pointed out the probable date of the institution of the oldest *Διονύσια* at Athens, B. C. 592, and that of the next to them, B. C. 510, all we have to do, in order to conclude this subject, is to remind

\* Or what is equally probable to the 11th, especially if the Dionysia *ἐν Λίμναις*, though properly attached to the 12th of the preceding month, had come by this time to be reckoned practically from the 11th. The equable date too of Sept. 7, B. C. 510, was falling on Pachon 11, (see p. 105.) and set back to Athyr 11 would fall on March 11, only four days later than Elaphebolion 11 the same year, cycle xi. 3.



the reader of the date of the institution of the Dionysia ἐν ἀγροῖς, or ἐν Πειραιεὶ; probably established also<sup>n</sup> in B.C. 503. To go into the details of these different representations would be foreign to our proper purpose. Both the ancient comedy and the ancient tragedy appear to have first come into existence between B. C. 592 and B. C. 510. It is most probable therefore that each of them grew originally out of the institution of the Διονύσια ἐν Αἴμναις, and that each was originally intended for those in particular.

SECTION XI.—*On the association of the Phallus with the Dionysia of Melampus.*

The introduction of the Phallus among the Greeks, as we have seen<sup>o</sup>, is attributed by Herodotus to Melampus; and if so, at the time when he instituted his Dionysia. And this fact being admitted, on the testimony of Herodotus, it is decisive of the true meaning of his Dionysos, and of the final end which he must have proposed by the institution of his Dionysia, from the first. As to the quarter from which he might have derived this symbol, it is far from improbable that even if he went to India in search of his own Dionysos, he must have met with it there, already associated with the rites and ceremonies of the Indian Deunus; for it is still in existence in India, under the name of the Lingam, and still recognised there as the type of the cosmogonic powers of nature. But there can be little doubt that as the ancient Hindoos derived the first idea of their Deunus from the ancient Egyptians, so did they this accompaniment of that idea; and there is just as little that, if Melampus brought his Dionysos into Greece from Egypt, he brought the Phallus into Greece from Egypt also. Of Egypt alone, among all the countries and all the nations of antiquity, has the unenviable distinction held good, that the first idea of the recognition and consecration of such an emblem as this, in the name of the generative powers of nature, was self-originated; and upon ancient Egypt must rest the guilt and the responsibility of that cumulative mass of licentiousness, impurity, and sensuality, which could not fail to ensue, and actually did ensue,

<sup>n</sup> Supra, p. 35.

<sup>o</sup> Supra, pag. 58.

in the course of time, wheresoever this symbol was openly received and tolerated. But on this subject it is not necessary for us to enlarge at present<sup>p</sup>. We allude to it merely for the sake of redeeming the promise, made in our *Fasti Catholici*, that we would some time or other collect the principal testimonies of antiquity to the use of the Phallus, and to the estimation in which it was held, both in Egypt and in Greece.

### Testimonies to the use of the Phallus, among the Egyptians and the Greeks.

i. Τὴν δὲ οὖν Ἱσιν πάντα τὰ μέρη τοῦ σώματος πλὴν τῶν αἰδοίων εὐρεῖν<sup>q</sup>... τὸ δὲ αἰδοῖον ὑπὸ μὲν Τυφῶνος εἰς ποταμὸν ρίφῃναι λέγουσι, διὰ τὸ μηδένα τῶν συνεργησάντων αὐτὸ λαβεῖν βουληθῆναι. ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἱσιδος οὐδὲν ἦττον τῶν ἄλλων ἀξιοθῆναι τιμῶν ἰσοθέων. ἔν τε γὰρ τοῖς ἱεροῖς εἰδῶλον αὐτοῦ κατασκευάσασαν τιμῶν καταδείξαι, καὶ κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ γινομένας ἐντιμώτατον ποιῆσαι...διὸ καὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας, ἕξ Αἰγύπτου παρεληφότας τὰ περὶ τοὺς ὄργιασμοὺς καὶ τὰς Διονυσιακὰς ἑορτὰς, τιμῶν τοῦτο τὸ μόριον ἔν τε τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ ταῖς τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου (Διονύσου) τελεταῖς τε καὶ θυσίαις, ὀνομάζοντας αὐτὸ φαλλόν<sup>r</sup>—Μόνον δὲ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ Ὀσίριδος τὴν Ἱσιν οὐχ εὐρεῖν τὸ αἰδοῖον· εὐθὺς γὰρ εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ρίφῃναι...τὴν δ' Ἱσιν ἀντ' ἐκείνου μίμημα ποιησαμένην καθιερώσαι τὸν φαλλόν, ᾧ καὶ νῦν ἑορτάζειν τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους<sup>s</sup>—Τὸν δὲ τράγον ἀπεθέωσαν, καθάπερ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησι τετιμῆσθαι λέγουσι τὸν Πρίαπον, διὰ τὸ γεννητικὸν μόριον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζῶον εἶναι τοῦτο κατωφερέστατον πρὸς τὰς συνουσίας, τὸ δὲ μόριον τοῦ σώματος, τὸ τῆς γενέσεως αἴτιον, τιμᾶσθαι προσηκόντως, ὡς ἂν ὑπάρχον ἀρχέγονον τῆς τῶν ζῶων φύσεως. καθόλου δὲ τὸ αἰδοῖον οὐκ Αἰγυπτίους μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οὐκ ὀλίγους καθιερωκέαι κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς, ὡς αἴτιον τῆς τῶν ζῶων γενέσεως<sup>t</sup>—Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀπόρρητος αὐτοῖς λόγος καὶ μυστικός. λέγουσι γοῦν ὅτι Αἰγύπτιοι πάντων ἀνθρώπων μετὰ τοὺς Φρύγας ἀρχαιότεροι καθεστῶτες, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ὁμολογουμένως τελετὰς καὶ ὄργια θεῶν πάντων ὁμοῦ...κατηγ-

<sup>p</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 106, xviii.  
<sup>107</sup>. cf. 127.

<sup>q</sup> Diodorus, i. 21.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. 22.

<sup>s</sup> Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*,

<sup>t</sup> Diodorus, i. 88. cf. ad iv. 6: Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* ii. 2. 117. § 12: Tzetzes, ad *Lycoph.* 212.

γελκότες... ἱερά καὶ σεβάσμια καὶ ἀνεξαγόρευτα τοῖς μὴ τετελεσμένοις τὰ Ἱσιδος ἔχουσι μυστήρια, τὰ δ' εἰσὶν οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ (τὸ) ἠρπασμένον καὶ ζητούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς ἑπταστόλου καὶ μελανείμονος αἰσχύνῃ Ὀσίριδος<sup>v</sup>.

ii. "Οστις δὲ τὰ Καβείρων ὄργια μεμύηται, τὰ Σαμοθρήικες ἐπιτελέουσι παραλαβόντες παρὰ Πελασγῶν, οὗτος ἀνὴρ οἶδε τὸ λέγω. τὴν γὰρ Σαμοθρήικην οἴκεον πρότερον Πελασγοὶ οὗτοι, τοῖ- περ Ἀθηναίοισι σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο<sup>x</sup> — Τάχα δ' ἂν χαίροι τοιοῦτῳ θύματι (τῷ τράγῳ) ὁ Διόνυσος, διὰ τὸ ἑαυτὸν εἶναι τὸν τράγον· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ οἱ ὄνοι ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ θαμίζουσι, καὶ οἱ φαλλοὶ αὐτῷ ἀνατίθενται, καὶ τὰ φαλλαγῳγία ἄγεται<sup>y</sup>—Οὕτω πάλιν τὸν τοῦ Διονύσου φαλλόν... καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλληνσι φαλλαγῳγία ἢ τοῦ φαλλοῦ ἑορτή· προσεκύνουν μὲν τοῦτον... οἱ ὀργιάζοντες ἅπαντες, τὸν δὲ λόγον οὐκ ᾔδουσαν· ὁ δὲ καλούμενος ἱεροφάντης ᾔδει τὸν Ὀσιριν καὶ τὸν Τυφῶνα, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ὑπὸ τοῦ Τυφῶνος κατακοπτόμενα μέλη καὶ πανταχόσε διασπειρόμενα, τὴν δὲ Ἱσιν, τὴν τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ἀδελφὴν, ταῦτα σὺν πόνῳ συλλέγουσαν, μόνον δὲ τὸν φαλλὸν οὐχ εὕρισκousαν, καὶ τούτου γε χάριν εἰκόνα τούτου κατασκευάζουσαν, καὶ παρὰ πάντων προσκυνεῖσθαι κελεύουσαν. ταῦτα ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὰ ὄργια μαθὼν (ὁ) Ὀδρῦσης Ὀρφεὺς<sup>z</sup> εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε, καὶ τὴν τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτὴν διεσκεύασεν<sup>a</sup>—Ἐπὶ τούτοις ἅπασι καὶ τότε προσκείσθω—

Ἄλλά κε Μηθύμνης ναέταις πολὺν λῳίον ἔσται  
φαλληνὸν τιμῶσι Διονύσιοιο κάρηνον.

θούουσι γὰρ αἱ πόλεις καὶ τελετὰς ἄγουσιν οὐ μόνον φαλληνοῖς Διονύσιοιο κάρηνοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ λιθίνοῖς καὶ χαλκέοις καὶ χρυσεῖς· οὐ μόνον φαλληνοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς Διονυσίοις, καὶ ἄλλοις παμπόλλοις Ἑσιοδεῖοις θεοῖς<sup>b</sup>—Καὶ τοῦτ' εἶναι τὸ μεγὰ καὶ κρύβιον τῶν ὄλων ἄγνωστον μυστήριον, παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις κεκαλυμμένον καὶ ἀνακεκαλυμμένον. οὐδεὶς (lege οὗτος) γὰρ, φησὶν, ἔστιν ἐν ναῶ πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου· οὐχ (lege οὗ) ἔστηκε γυμνὸν τὸ κεκρυμμένον, κάτωθεν ἄνω βλέπον... ἐστάναι δὲ οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς ἁγιωτάτοις πρὸ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ναοῖς λέγουσι τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ (γὰρ) καὶ ..... ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς καὶ πάσαις ἀγνιαῖς, καὶ παρ' αὐταῖς ταῖς οἰκίαις, ὄρον τινα καὶ τέρμα τῆς οἰκίας προτεταγμένοι. καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ ἀγα-

<sup>v</sup> Origen, *Philosophumena*, v. 7. 101.

98.

<sup>x</sup> Herodotus, ii. 51.

<sup>y</sup> Phurnutus, 30. p. 218. De Dionysio.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. ii. 71. § 32: 70. § 30: 96.

§ 95.

<sup>a</sup> Theodoret, *Græc. Affect. Curatio*, i. 50. § 113. cf. iii. 142. § 84: vi. 282. § 11.

<sup>b</sup> Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* v. 36. Pag. 494. Ex CEnomao.

θὸν ὑπὸ πάντων λεγόμενον· ἀγαθηφόρον γὰρ αὐτὸ καλοῦσιν... καὶ τοῦτο Ἑλληνας μυστικὸν ἀπὸ Αἰγυπτίων παραλαβόντες, φυλάσσοῦσι μέχρι σήμερον. τοὺς γοῦν Ἑρμῆς, φησὶ, παρ' αὐτοῖς τοιοῦτῳ τετιμημένους σχήματι θεωροῦμεν. Κυλλήνιοι δὲ διαφερόντως τιμῶντες λόγον (φησὶ γάρ· Ἑρμῆς ἐστὶ λόγος, ἑρμηνεὺς ὢν καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν γεγυότων ὁμοῦ καὶ γινομένων καὶ ἐσομένων)· παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενος ἔστηκε τοιοῦτῳ τινὶ κεχαρκτηριασμένος σχήματι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν αἰσχρὴν ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω δρμῆν ἔχων<sup>c</sup>.

Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὸν, φησὶ, Φρύγες καὶ χλοερὸν στάχυν τεθερισμένον· καὶ μετὰ τοὺς Φρύγας Ἀθηναῖοι μυοῦντες Ἐλευσίαια, καὶ ἐπιδεικνύντες τοῖς ἐποπτεύουσι τὸ μέγα... μυστήριον, ἐν σιωπῇ τεθερισμένον στάχυν. ὁ δὲ στάχυν οὗτός ἐστι καὶ παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις κ', τ. λ.<sup>d</sup>—*Nam et illa Eleusinia, hæresis et ipsa Atticæ superstitionis, quod tacent pudor est. idcirco et aditum (aditurum) prius cruciant, diutius initiant quam consignant, cum et portas (epoptas) ante quinquennium instituunt, ut opinionem suspensio cognitionis ædificent, atque ita tantam majestatem exhibere videantur, quantam præstruxerunt cupiditatem. sequitur jam silentii officium. adtente custoditur quod tarde invenitur. ceterum tota in adytis divinitas. tot suspiria portarum, totum signaculum linguæ, simulacrum membri virilis revelatur<sup>e</sup>—* Ἀσελγῶν ὑμῖν μορίων ἄξιος Ἀφροδίτη γίνεται καρπός. ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ταύτης τῆς πελαγίας ἠδόνης τεκμήριον τῆς γουῆς, ἁλῶν χόνδρος καὶ φαλλὸς τοῖς μυομένοις τὴν τέχνην τὴν μοιχικὴν ἐπιδίδοται<sup>f</sup>.

Φαλλὸς ξύλον ἐπίμηκες, ἔχον ἐκ τῷ ἄκρῳ σκυτινὸν αἰδοῖον ἐξηρητημένον. Ἰστατο δὲ ὁ φαλλὸς τῷ Διονύσῳ κατὰ τι μυστήριον. περὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ φαλλοῦ τοιαῦτα λέγεται. Πηγασὸς ἐκ τῶν Ἐλευθερῶν, αἱ δὲ Ἐλευθεραὶ πόλις εἰσὶ Βοιωτίας, λαβὼν Διονύσου τὸ ἄγαλμα ἦκεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν· οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐκ ἐδέξαντο μετὰ τιμῆς τὸν θεόν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀμισθί γε αὐτοῖς ταῦτα βουλευσαμένοις ἀπέβη. μηνίσαντος γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ νόσος κατέσκηψε εἰς τὰ αἰδοῖα τῶν ἀνδρῶν... ὡς δὲ ἀπέιπον πρὸς τὴν νόσον... ἀπεστάλησαν θεωροὶ μετὰ σπουδῆς κ', τ. λ. πεισθέντες οὖν τοῖς ἠγγελημένοις οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι φαλλοὺς ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ δημοσίᾳ κατεσκεύασαν, καὶ τούτοις ἐγέραιρον τὸν θεόν, ὑπόμνημα ποιούμενοι τοῦ πάθους. ἴσως δὲ καὶ

<sup>c</sup> Origen, Phil. v. 7. 102. 30.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. v. 8. 115. 85.

<sup>e</sup> Tertullian, ii. 143. Adv. Valentinianos i.

<sup>f</sup> Clemens Alex. Protrept. ii. § 14. pag. 15. l. 18.

ὅτι παίδων γενέσεως αἴτιος ὁ θεός<sup>ε</sup>—'Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ Σάγγρα (corr. Ἄγραυς) μυστήρια καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἀλιμοῦντι τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀθήνησιν περιώρισται· αἴτχος δὲ δὴ κοσμικὸν οἷ τε ἀγῶνες καὶ οἱ φαλλοὶ οἱ Διούσῳ ἐπιτελούμενοι, κακῶς ἐπιενεμημένοι τὸν βίον ... ὑπόμνημα τοῦ πάθους τούτου μυστικὸν φαλλοὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἀνίσταται Διούσῳ. εἰ μὴ γὰρ Διούσῳ πομπὴν ἐποιοῦντο καὶ ὕμνεον ἄσμα, αἰδοίοισιν ἀναιδέστατα εἴργασται, φησὶν Ἡρακλείτος, ὡντὸς δὲ Ἄϊδης καὶ Διόνυσος ὅτεφ μαίρονται καὶ ληναίξουσιν οὐ διὰ τὴν μέθην τοῦ σώματος, ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι, τοσοῦτον ὅσον διὰ τὴν ἐπονείδιστον τῆς ἀσελγείας ἱεροφαντίαν<sup>h</sup>—Jam dudum me fateor hæsitare ... dum pudor me habet Alimontia illa proferre mysteria, quibus in Liberi honorem patris phallos subrigit Græcia, et simulacris virilium fascinorum territoria cuncta florescunt<sup>i</sup>.

De Pamyliis apud Ægyptios<sup>k</sup>: so called from Παμύλης, the first who announced the birth of Osiris: Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θρέψαι τὸν Ὀσιριν, ἐγχειρίσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Κρόνου, καὶ τὴν τῶν Παμυλίων ἑορτὴν αὐτῷ καλεῖσθαι, Φαλληφορίοις ἐοικυῖαν—Πααμύλης<sup>l</sup>. Αἰγύπτιος θεὸς Πριαπῶδης. Κρατῖνος ὁ νεώτερος Γίγασιν Ὡς σφοδρῶς ἢ Αἰγυπτῶδης Σώχαρις Παᾶμύλης<sup>m</sup>—'Ἰθύφαλλοι<sup>n</sup> ... ποιήματα τινα οὕτως ἐλέγετο τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ φαλλῷ ᾄδόμενα ... ἐλέγετο δὲ κυρίως ἰθύφαλλος τὸ ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖοι, ὡς Κρατῖνος ἐν Ἀρχιλόχοις—'Ἰθύφαλλοι<sup>o</sup>. οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ ὀρχήστρᾳ (ita leg.) καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ φαλλῷ γυναικεῖαν σπολὴν ἔχοντες. λέγεται δὲ φαλλὸς ὅτε μὲν καὶ τὸ αἰδοῖοι<sup>p</sup> καὶ ποιήματα δὲ καλεῖσθαι ἃ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱσταμένῳ φαλλῷ ᾄδεται—Οἱ τοὺς ἰθυφάλλους ἐν τῇ ὀρχήστρᾳ ὀρχοῦμενοι. ποιήματα δὲ τινα οὕτω λέγεται, τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ φαλλῷ ᾄδόμενα. ἐλέγετο δὲ κυρίως ἰθύφαλλος τὸ ἐντεταμένον αἰδοῖοι<sup>p</sup>—'Ἐστι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ

<sup>ε</sup> Scholia in Acharn. 242. ὁ Ξανθίας τὸν φαλλόν. cf. ad 258. 260. 262.

<sup>h</sup> Clemens Alex. Protrepticon, ii. § 34. pag. 29. l. 18: cf. ad § 39. pag. 33. l. 17, at Sikyon.

<sup>i</sup> Arnobius, v. 176. cf. 184, 185. The story follows. Alimus was one of the δῆμοι of Attica; Schol. ad Aves, 496. Ἄλιμοντῆδε. Δῆμος τῆς Λεοντίδος φυλῆς. cf. Etym. M. Ἄλιμοῦς: Anecdota Græca, 376. 25. Ἄλιμούσιος. Pausanias, i. xxxi. 1: Ἄ δὲ εἰς μνήμην παρείχοντο, Ἄλιμουσίοις μὲν Θεσμοφόρου Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης ἔστιν ἱερὸν κ', τ. λ. cf. supra, Vol. iv. 271 n.

<sup>k</sup> Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, xii.

<sup>l</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. in Παμύτης Αἰγύπτιος θεός.

<sup>n</sup> Harpocration.

<sup>o</sup> Photii Lex.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. cf. Hesychius, Ἰθύφαλλοι:

Εὐθύφαλλον: Περιφάλλεα. Πομπὴ Διούσῳ τελουμένη τῶν φαλλῶν: Φαληρίς: Φαλλός: Φαλλικά. Phot. Lex. Φαλλικόν: ποίημα αὐτοσχέδιον, ἐπὶ τῷ φαλλῷ ᾄδόμενον. Φαλλοί: Pargemio. Græci, 90. e Cod. Bodl. 743: Ὁ Φαλλὸς τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπονεμόντων ἐνίοις τὰ οἰκεία καὶ πρόσφορα τίθεται. cf. Pron. Diogen. Centuria vii. 22. pag. 213: Plutarch, Proverb. &c. lii. Ἐπεὶ τῷ Διούσῳ ἴστατο ὁ φαλλός.

ἐπίσημον καὶ τὸ δίμετρον βραχυκατάληκτον, τὸ καλούμενον ἰθυφαλικὸν, ᾧ πρῶτος μὲν Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται, συζεύξας αὐτῷ δακτυλικὸν τετράμετρον οὕτως·

Οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς θάλπει ἀπαλὸν χροά· κάρφεται γὰρ ἦδη P.

Veniebamus etiam nos aliquando adolescentes ad spectacula ludibriaque sacrilegiorum: spectabamus arreptitios, audiebamus symphonicos, ludis turpissimis qui Diis Deabusque exhibebantur oblectabamur, (ut) Cælesti Virgini et Berecynthiæ Matri Deorum omnium; ante cujus lecticani die solemnī lavationis ejus talia per publicum cantitabantur a nequissimis scenicis, qualia non dico matrem deorum sed matrem qualiumcunque senatorum, vel quorumlibet honestorum virorum, immo vero qualia nec matrem ipsorum scenicorum, deceret audire. habet enim quiddam erga parentes humana verecundia, quod nec ipsa nequitia possit auferre. illam proinde turpitudinem obscænorum dictorum atque factorum scenicos ipsos domi suæ proludendi causa coram matribus suis agere puderet, quam per publicum agebant coram deum matre, spectante et audiente utriusque sexus frequentissima multitudine q.

### CHAPTER III.

*On the Theban Dionysos, or the Dionysos of the popular Hellenic mythology; on the foundation of Thebes by Cadmus; and on the Sphere of Cadmus.*

SECTION I.—*Dionysos, the son of Zeus and Semele, a fabulous character, of later date than the Dionysos of Melampus.*

The well known fable relating to the parentage and birth of the Dionysos of classical mythology represented him as the son of Zeus and Semele, the daughter of Cadmus. It is unnecessary to object to this representation, that as the Zeus of this genealogy never could have had a real existence, so

P Hephestion, *περὶ μέτρων*. vi. § 5. *περὶ τροχαϊκοῦ*: cf. vii. § 5. *περὶ δακτυλικοῦ*: also Schol. ad Acharn. 260–262. Φαλῆς ἑταίρε Βάκχου.

q Augustin, *De Civitate*, ii. 4.

there is good reason to suspect that the Semele too never could have been a real person. But the simple impossibility, that the Dionysos of the popular mythology could have been the son of two such parents as these, follows from the fact that Zeus on the one hand was not older than Minos, and Semele on the other, as the daughter of Cadmus, was little less than an hundred years older than Zeus.

That the Theban Dionysos then must have been a conception of later date than the Dionysos of Melampus, there can be no doubt; and this being the case, it is almost superfluous to be at any pains to reconcile the popular fable of his birth, and his subsequent history, with the account just given of the first conception and first introduction of this idea and this name among the Greeks, further at least than to shew, if possible, in what manner this fabulous history of the Greek Dionysos might have arisen out of the true, and have been founded at bottom upon the true. And though, in order to the illustration of this point, nothing would appear to be more necessary than to ascertain in the first instance the earliest date at which this fable began to appear; we shall find it convenient to reserve that question for the present. We may allow that it was older than Hesiod, but it does not follow that it was older than Homer, unless everything which is read in the Iliad or the Odyssey at present, merely because it occurs there, is to be considered Homer's.

In our opinion, a very simple explanation is competent to connect this Dionysos of the popular mythology with the original conception of Melampus; and to shew by what steps and what association of ideas, it was easy to ascend from the latter to the former. For i. There was no difference between them, not even in name. ii. The Dionysos of Melampus came from Thebes in Egypt; the Dionysos of the popular fable came from Thebes too—Thebes in Bœotia. iii. Bœotian Thebes itself derived its origin from Egyptian, and Cadmus, the founder of the former, came from the latter. It is manifest that, under such circumstances, there was no difference between the historical Dionysos, and the mythological one, except one of *time*—that the mythological Dionysos, as the son of Semele, the daughter of Cadmus, was older than the Dionysos of Melampus; and one of *place*—that the mytho-

logical Dionysos appeared first at Thebes, the Dionysos of Melampus at Argos.

This we believe to be in brief the true explanation of the later and popular conception, in contradistinction to the Dionysos of Melampus. The Dionysos of this fable, in every essential respect, was the same with the Dionysos of Melampus, which we may call the historical Dionysos, as having had an historical date and time; but he was an older Dionysos, because Cadmus was older than Melampus, and this Dionysos was the grandson of Cadmus. And as the historical Dionysos ultimately came from Egypt, so did this mythological one, but through Cadmus, not through Melampus. All this, it is manifest, would be consistent, if the final end of this later fable was simply to shew that, without calling in question the reality of such a conception and such a person as that of the Dionysos of Melampus, the true exemplar and prototype even of this idea and this person, was the Theban, the grandson of Cadmus. And this view of the final end of the fable is strikingly confirmed by the following coincidence, which is well adapted also to confirm the epoch assigned to the Dionysian correction of Melampus.

It has been seen, that though the idea and the name of his Dionysos were derived by Melampus from those of the Indian Deunus, the original of both was in reality the Egyptian Osiris; and this idea and this name having been first introduced into Egypt, *Æra Cyclica* 2657, B. C. 1350, it is evident that, on the principle of the Cyclico-Julian corrections of antiquity, if such a calendar had come into existence among the Egyptians along with this fable, attached to Athyr 17 in the equable, October 6 in the Julian *æra*, of the time being, the first period of this calendar would have expired, and the second would have begun, *Æra Cyclica* 2777, B. C. 1230; that is, exactly at the time selected by Melampus for the introduction of the name and the worship of his Dionysos, and for the Dionysian correction, intended to regulate his Dionysia, instituted along with it. And this, it must be admitted, is a remarkable confirmation of the epoch which we have assigned to both, Athyr 17, *Æra Cyc.* 2777, and Sept. 7, B. C. 1230. But it is an equally decisive proof that the true prototype of the Dionysos of Melampus, even in the opinion



of its author, must have been the Egyptian Osiris, and that to go back to the real origin of the Dionysos of Melampus himself, who might seem to have come into existence first, B. C. 1230, you must ascend to that of the Egyptian Osiris, 120 years before.

If then it was known to the author of the fable of the Theban Dionysos, that the Dionysos of Melampus, though brought into existence in Greece *de facto* only B. C. 1230, was virtually as old as the Egyptian Osiris, it is very conceivable that he might think it necessary to set back the birth even of the historical Dionysos, 120 years before his actual time. And if he was also aware that this was the time when Cadmus too came from Egypt into Greece, and from the same quarter in Egypt itself as the first idea of the Dionysos of Melampus, nothing could appear to him more natural than the inference from these facts, viz. that the true epoch of the historical Dionysos of Melampus was virtually that of the coming of Cadmus into Greece, as well as that of the birth of Osiris in Egypt. And this being assumed as the actual foundation of the fable, all the rest, that is, its circumstances and particulars, may be set down to the embellishments of fancy, and to the licence in such respects claimed by the fabulists and poets of old. The historical basis of the whole would still be the fact that the Dionysos of Melampus was virtually the Osiris of the Egyptians, and if virtually the same with Osiris, virtually as old as Cadmus; and the inference from this fact would still be both possible and probable, that, if as old as Cadmus, he might have been brought into Greece by Cadmus.

It is evident therefore that, in order to the further explanation of this fable, nothing would now be more necessary than the consideration of the time when Cadmus came into Greece, and of the quarter from which he came; and if it turned out, as the result of this inquiry, that he must have come from Thebes, in Egypt, and at or about the actual time of the introduction of the worship of Osiris itself into Egypt, we should want nothing more to account for the origin of the fable of the Dionysos of Thebes, in contradistinction to the Dionysos of Melampus. We should now understand that there was never any real difference between them; only that

the Dionysos of Thebes, as the older of the two, and as coæval at Thebes with the common prototype of both, Osiris, was the better entitled to the name.

And here it is necessary to point out an important distinction, which bears directly on this question, of the date of the coming of Cadmus into Greece. It has been seen from the traditionary fable of the Indian expedition of the Theban Dionysos, that, when it was invented, it must have been known there was an interval of three years between the supposed birth of this Dionysos, and the recognition of his divinity, at Thebes, his birthplace itself. And assuming that according to the author of this fable, the date of his birth was virtually that of the birth of Osiris, if you go back 120 years from B. C. 1230, the date of the historical Dionysos, you come to B. C. 1350, the actual date of the birth of Osiris in Egypt. If you go back 120 years from B. C. 1227, three years after the first rise and appearance of the historical Dionysos, and the date of his recognition, as we have seen reason to conclude, in other quarters of Greece distinct from Argos, you come to B. C. 1347—but as the date of what? and in what relation to the supposed birth of the Theban Dionysos as the same with that of the Egyptian Osiris also?

We can answer this question only conjecturally, yet not without great probability; viz. that as B. C. 1350 was the actual date of the birth of Osiris in Egypt, so B. C. 1347, just three years later, was the actual date of the coming of Cadmus from Egypt to Thebes, bringing Osiris with him, as it might be supposed, in the form and under the name of the Dionysos of Thebes: that these suppositions were critically accommodated to each other,—that it was known to the author of the fable that the historical date of the Dionysia of Melampus was B. C. 1230, the virtual or true date was B. C. 1350, and the date of his first introduction into Greece, if he came with Cadmus, was the date of the coming of Cadmus, three years later—and that the circumstances of the fable were adapted accordingly; the invasion of India by the Theban Dionysos, as soon as born, to B. C. 1350; the return in triumph, and the recognition of his divinity, just three years later, to the actual date of the coming of Cadmus, and the foundation of Thebes, B. C. 1347.

And from such coincidences as these, which are too remarkable to have been accidental, we may justly infer that whosoever was the author of this fable, he was probably a Theban, whose principal motive in the invention of it was to vindicate to his native city, and to the family of its founder, instead of Argos and Melampus, the honour of having given birth to Dionysos. And we may also infer that he must have invented the fable before the actual truth on these points had yet been forgotten. So much therefore for the presumption, established by such coincidences as these, that the true date of the coming of Cadmus into Greece will turn out to be B. C. 1347. We must now proceed to confirm that presumption by other proofs.

SECTION II.—*On the time of Cadmus, and of his coming into Greece.*

The first clue to the probable discovery of the truth on these two points is the date of the first expedition against Thebes. It is agreed that there were five generations between Cadmus and this expedition; in which Eteocles and Polynices, both standing fifth in the line of descent from Cadmus, were concerned alike.

Now it has been already shown<sup>r</sup>, that the date of the second expedition (that of the Epigoni) must have been B. C. 1202, and that of the first, twenty years before, B. C. 1222; and each of these dates, we hope, will be further confirmed hereafter. And forasmuch as, to judge from the circumstances preliminary to the expedition, which have been left on record, it could not have been more than two years after the death of Œdipus; if the date of the expedition was the spring or summer of B. C. 1222, that of the death of Œdipus may be assumed to have been B. C. 1224. Let us corroborate this conclusion, before we proceed any further, by the testimony of Hesiod and Homer.

i. It may be inferred from Hesiod's account of the representatives of his Fourth Age, (the Heroic age in general,) that the heroes of Troy and their contemporaries, (all of whom he includes among them,) were none of them too young to

<sup>r</sup> *Supra*, pag. 72.

have taken a part in the first expedition against Thebes, though they also fought against Troy.

Ἡμίθεοι προτέρη γενεῇ κατ' ἀπείρονα γαίαν.  
καὶ τοὺς μὲν πολεμὸς τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνὴ  
τοὺς μὲν ἐφ' ἑπταπύλῳ Θήβῃ Καδμηΐδι γαίῃ  
ᾤλεσε, μαρναμένους μῆλων ἔνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο,  
τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαΐτμα θαλάσσης  
ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγῶν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠῦκόμοιο <sup>s</sup>—

And this must imply that between the death of Œdipus and the war of Troy there could not have been much more than an interval of 30 years; and that would strictly be the case, if the death of Œdipus is dated B. C. 1224, and the sailing of the Trojan expedition, B. C. 1190.

ii. It is observable that, according to Homer's account of the funeral games of Patroclus, one of the combatants in the contest of the cæstus, Euryalus, is spoken of as having entered the lists, for the same kind of prize, at the funeral games of Œdipus.

Εὐρύαλος δὲ οἱ οἶος ἀνίστατο ἰσόθεος φῶς,  
Μηκιστέος υἱὸς Ταλαϊονίδαο ἄνακτος,  
ὅς ποτε Θήβασδ' ἦλθε δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο  
ἐς τάφον· ἔνθα δὲ πάντας ἐνίκα Καδμειώνας <sup>t</sup>.

The date of these games of Patroclus was B. C. 1181. Those of Œdipus must have been B. C. 1224, 43 years before. And yet it is evident that if Euryalus was not more than 20, when he contended at the latter, he would not be too old to be contending also at the former. Nor would his probable age at this time, sixty or sixty-three, much exceed the average age of all the heroes who fought at Troy; especially in the last year of the war, when many would be fifty or sixty who had not been more than forty or fifty when they set out on the expedition. We have seen that this was the case with Idomeneus in particular <sup>v</sup>: and we have also seen <sup>x</sup> that Diomed and Sthenelus, the two youngest, or among the youngest, of these heroes, having been only just born B. C. 1222, were forty at least B. C. 1181.

In the next place, with regard to the number of generations between Cadmus and the Epigoni; Cadmus, according to Hesiod, had five children, four daughters, and one son.

<sup>s</sup> Opera et Dios, 159.

<sup>t</sup> Iliad. Ψ. 677.

<sup>v</sup> Vol. iv. 390.

<sup>x</sup> Supra, p. 73.

Κάδμω δ' Ἀρμονίη θυγάτηρ χρυσοῆς Ἀφροδίτης  
 Ἴνώ καὶ Σεμέλην καὶ Ἀγαυὴν καλλιπάρηον,  
 Αὐτονόην θ', ἣν γῆμεν Ἀρισταῖος βαθυχαίτης,  
 γείνατο, καὶ Πολύδωρον, εὖστεφάνω ἐνὶ Θήβη ὕ.

And we may take it for granted that he must have had a son, and that son might have borne the name of Polydorus; for it is certain that the family of Cadmus did not expire with Cadmus, it survived him for five generations at least: and if so, he must have left a son—through whom the line of descent from himself was carried on. But with respect to his daughters; there is great reason, in our opinion, to be sceptical, if not about their actual existence, yet about what is known of it from history or tradition, and the use which they are made to serve as real persons, and in the relation of daughters to Cadmus, in their proper order of time. There is none of the four at least with whose personal history and in that relation something purely fabulous, and consequently incredible, is not inseparably connected; for the sake of which even her personal existence might have been imagined: the fable of Actæon with that of Autoñoë, the fable of Pentheus with that of Agave, the fable of Melikertes with that of Ino, and the fable of Dionysos with that of Semele. And with respect to the order of the birth of this one son and these four daughters respectively; Nonnus indeed makes Polydorus the youngest of the children of Cadmus, born after the youngest of the daughters, Semele.

Ἄρσενα δ' ὀψιτέλευτον ὁμόζυγα θήλει φύτλη  
 Ἀρμονίη νέον νιὰ γεγηθότι γείνατο Κάδμω,  
 Ἄονίης Πολύδωρον ἑωσφόρον ἀστέρα πατρης,  
 ὀπλότερον Σεμέλης ῥοδοειδέος, ὃν παρὰ Θήβαις  
 σκῆπτρα λαβῶν ἀθέμιστος ἄναξ ἀπενόσφισε Πενθεύς<sup>z</sup>.

But this is a supposition which we need not hesitate to reject, as being contrary to the traditionary explanation of the name of this Polydorus itself; viz. that he was so called because of the *many gifts* which the gods, who had graced the marriage-feast of Cadmus and Harmonia with their presence, made them on that occasion: Πολύδωρον· ὃν καὶ Πίνακα ἔνιοι καλοῦσιν. εἴρηται δὲ Πολύδωρος ὅτι ἐν τῷ γάμῳ τοῦ Κάδμου καὶ τῆς Ἀρμονίας οἱ θεοὶ δωρεὰς ἐπορίσαντο<sup>a</sup>. If so, he must have

<sup>y</sup> Theogonia, 975. cf. 937: Diodor. Sic. iv. 2.

<sup>z</sup> v. 206. cf. 190.

<sup>a</sup> Schol. ad Hesiod. Theogon. 975.

been their first child, the *πρωτότοκος* of the family; the first fruit of the marriage itself.

We will assume then that Polydorus was really the oldest of the children of Cadmus, and as much an historical character in his proper order of time, and as necessary to the continuance of the family of Cadmus in the male line, down to the time of the Epigoni, as Cadmus himself. The number of generations from Cadmus to the Epigoni is invariably represented as five: Polydorus, Labdacus, Laius, Œdipus, Eteocles or Polynices.

Ὅς παῖδα γήμας Κύπριδος Ἀρμονίαν ποτὲ  
Πολύδωρον ἐξέφυσε, τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακον,  
φῦναι λέγουσιν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦδε Λαῖον<sup>b</sup>—

Τῷ Λαβδακείῳ παιδί, Πολυδώρου τε καὶ  
τοῦ πρόσθε Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι τ' Ἀγήνορος<sup>c</sup>—

Σκόπει δέ<sup>d</sup>. ἀπὸ Ἰοῦς Ἐπαφος· οὗ Λιβύη, ἧς Βῆλος, οὗ Φοῖνιξ καὶ Ἀγήνωρ, οὗ Κάδμος, οὗ Πολύδωρος, οὗ Λάβδακος, οὗ Λαῖος, οὗ Οἰδιποῦς, οὗ Ἐτεοκλῆς καὶ Πολυνείκης—Κάδμου γὰρ Πολυδώρος· τοῦ δὲ Λάβδακος· τοῦ δὲ Λαῖος· τοῦ δὲ Οἰδιποῦς· εἶτα Ἐτεοκλῆς· τοῦ δὲ Πολυδώρος· τοῦ δὲ Αἴμων κ', τ. λ.<sup>e</sup>

With respect to some of these names, Apollodorus<sup>f</sup> tells us that Labdacus, the father of Laius, died when the latter was one year old; and that seems to have been an authentic circumstance of his personal history, handed down by tradition: and if so, it authorises the inference that Labdacus died early in life. He mentions also<sup>f</sup>, that Lycus, the son of Pentheus, usurped and held the kingdom between Labdacus and Laius, 20 years; which also may have been true, understood at least to mean that he succeeded to the government during the minority of Laius, and that Laius himself began to reign at 19 or 20 years of age. From what he mentions too<sup>f</sup> of Laius, and Chrysippus the son of Pelops<sup>g</sup>, confirmed by the ancient Scholiasts, we may infer that the acme of Laius in particular must have come between that of Pelops, and the

<sup>b</sup> Euripides, *Phœnissæ*, 7. De Cadmo.

<sup>c</sup> Œdipus Tyr. 267.

<sup>d</sup> Scholia in *Phœn.* 247. Κοινὸν αἶμα.

cf. ad 291. ὦ συγγένεια: and ad 1008.

<sup>e</sup> Schol. in Pindar. *Olymp.* ii. 16.

ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα. cf. ad 80. 82: also

Apollodorus, *Biblioth.* iii. i. § 1: iv.

§ 1, 2: v. § 5. 7: vi. § 1-4.

<sup>f</sup> iii. v. 5.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. Thucydides, i. 9: Euripides, *Fragm.* Chrysippus: Hyginus, *Fabb.* lxxxv.

early life of Chrysippus ; i. e. he must have been a good deal younger than Pelops, yet not much older than Chrysippus. And therefore, if Pelops (as there is reason to conclude) was born about B. C. 1310, Laius was probably born 20 or 30 years later.

From the facts too of the personal history of Œdipus, which have been left on record, we may assume that he must have been a young man at the time of his marriage to Jocasta, and comparatively young still at the time of his death. Having therefore probably collected the date of his death, B. C. 1224, from that of the first expedition against Thebes, B. C. 1222, whichever of his two sons, Eteocles and Polynices, may be supposed to have been the oldest, (and though testimony on this point is not uniform, it seems to have been Eteocles<sup>h</sup>;) we may assume that he was born twenty years before the death of Œdipus, and that Œdipus himself was not more than twenty or twenty-one at the same time also : and we may arrange these different generations, from Eteocles upwards to Polydorus, as follows.

Birth of Eteocles,	B. C. 1244
Birth of Œdipus,	— 1265
Birth of Laius,	— 1286
Birth of Labdacus,	— 1316
Birth of Polydorus,	— 1346.

And this will give the marriage of Cadmus, and his coming into Greece, and the foundation of Thebes, agreeably to the presumption to that effect, the ground of which we explained in the preceding section, B. C. 1347.

### SECTION III.—*On the quarter from which Cadmus came into Greece.*

With respect to this question, since it is agreed that Cadmus came into Greece from abroad, but that he did not come alone—he was the leader of a colony which settled in Greece, and the founder of a city which ever afterwards had an historical existence in Greece—the question which we have to consider is that of the quarter, from which the colony under Cadmus may most probably be supposed to have come.

<sup>h</sup> Cf. Schol. in Phœn. 55. 71, 72 : Schol. in Œdip. Colon. 375 : Diodorus, iv. 65.

And to such a question, the analogy of what appears to have been going on in Egypt, in particular, at the very point of time, to which we have just seen reason to reduce the acme of Cadmus, is very important, and sufficient *per se* to supply the answer.

For it appears, as we have repeatedly had occasion to observe, that beginning almost this very year, B. C. 1347, a great and general movement must have gone on in Egypt, and continued for several years, in the shape of the migration of colonies from that country to various quarters, and particularly to Greece; the fact of which is attested not only by the local and gentile traditions of the countries where those colonies settled, but by the testimony of time, (the laws of equable time at least,) in Corrections of the primitive calendar, and by that of some of the most remarkable institutions of the same communities—made at the same time, marking and signalling at first the epochs of such migrations, and the arrival of these different colonies in their new abode, and serving as a memorial of them ever after.

Argive tradition among the Greeks testified to a colony from Egypt of this kind, which settled at Argos; and was accompanied there, and attested ever after, by the institution of the Egyptian Isia, under the name of the Thesmophoria. Attic tradition bore witness to another, which settled in Attica, and was attested ever after, not only by the foundation of the city of Athens, but by the introduction of the name and worship of the Attic Athena, and by the national solemnity of the Athenæa, and by the Athenaic correction of the primitive calendar, simultaneously with it. Ancient Italic tradition testified to the settlement of a colony from Egypt in Italy, which became the nation of the Umbrians there, the first and oldest of its national divisions themselves; and was attested and commemorated too by the first correction of the primitive calendar, on the Nundinal principle.

It adds not a little to the observableness of this phenomenon, and to the probability of the inference, that so many migrations, and in such different directions, all from one quarter, (the ancient Egypt,) must have been the effect of some cause or other peculiar to Egypt in particular, that the times of these migrations, determined by the tests and



criteria in question, and especially by the corrections of the calendar, which accompanied them, are seen to have fallen out so nearly simultaneously; the migration to Argos and the institution of the Thesmophoria, B. C. 1346, the migration to Attica and the institution of the Athenæa, and the Athenæic correction of Erechtheus, B. C. 1342, the migration to Italy and the first Nundinal correction of the primitive calendar, B. C. 1340. It is self-evident that, if each of these migrations was an actual matter of fact in its proper order of time, all must have been the consequence of something peculiar to Egypt, and affecting Egypt, and producing an effect like this in Egypt, between these limits of B. C. 1346, and B. C. 1340, at least.

And that being the case, the only rational and consistent explanation of a phenomenon which, under the almost total dearth of information at present respecting the history of the world at this period, anywhere but in Judæa, would otherwise be very inexplicable, is supplied by the fact, the evidence of which we had occasion to consider in our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>i</sup>; viz. that about B. C. 1350, and probably that very year itself, (which was memorable in Egypt above all others as that of the introduction of their great national Fable of Osiris and Isis, and that of the institution of their national solemnity of the Isia, and that of the beginning of the first Sothiacal period,) and probably in the first year of the reign of the ancient Egyptian king, called Mœris, which seems to have fallen out coincidentally with it, (in some year at least not long after the beginning of his reign.) the Egyptians appear to have begun one of their national works, the greatest which they ever undertook, not excepting the pyramids, or the labyrinth, or any other of those colossal and stupendous buildings, which have made ancient Egypt the wonder and admiration of all subsequent ages—the excavation of the lake or reservoir of Mœris, in the upper region of the Delta, in that part of modern Egypt, which is still called the Fa-youm, from its ancient name of Pi-youm, or *the Sea*, derived from this lake itself<sup>k</sup>.

The magnitude of this undertaking, which proposed the

<sup>i</sup> iii. 192 sqq.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. the Baron Bunsen's *Egypt*, tom. ii. 328 sqq.

excavation of a basin, 360 miles in circumference, 120 in diameter, and 120 yards deep in the centre, and not only proposed it, but sometime or other accomplished it, can leave no doubt of the toil and labour, the expense of money, and the length of time, which must have been necessary for that purpose. And as there is no reason to suppose it was not executed by the Egyptians both *for* and *by* themselves, we may presume it must have been effected by a division and distribution of the task, in some manner or other, among the whole of the population; which, without pressing unequally on any part, would nevertheless press heavily and unceasingly for a time upon all.

It is therefore the most probable explanation of the simultaneous migratory movement which begins to appear in Egypt, within four years after the commencement of this undertaking, to suppose it was due to it; that numbers of native Egyptians, wearied out with years of toil already spent upon it, and with the prospect of more before them, determined to leave their country, and to go in search of relief and rest elsewhere. And it would no doubt be an additional stimulus to the adoption of these very obvious means of escape from any further share in a burden which was beginning to be intolerable; that nothing at this period of the history of the world was easier than for those, who could no longer live in peace and comfort in their own country, to find another home elsewhere. The world at this period of its history, notwithstanding what many of the learned have imagined to the contrary, was still very imperfectly peopled; as it could scarcely fail to be within a thousand years only of the Deluge, and nine hundred years only of the Dispersion, when three families, with their respective divisions and subdivisions, were all that went forth in different directions to replenish the wastes and solitudes left by the Deluge. The most populous country at this time, for various reasons, was probably Egypt itself. The Egyptians in particular, with the peculiar facilities for multiplication which they derived from their climate, might well have grown up into a nation, even in a thousand years after the Flood: and the fact itself, into the causes of which we are inquiring, that so many colonies appear to have left Egypt about the same time, yet in the

midst of one of the greatest, and longest, and most laborious of their national undertakings, is quite in harmony with that supposition, proving demonstratively that ancient Egypt had population enough at this very time not only for the services required from it at home, but for these draughts upon it to other quarters.

But with respect to the rest of the world, at the same point of time in general, if we may confine ourselves at present to the particular case of the ancient Hellas, there is every reason to believe that before the coming of Danaus, and the foundation of the city of Argos, the Peloponnese, as it was afterwards called, was very imperfectly peopled. Even Homer, so much later than Danaus, knew of the people of that part of Greece by no other name than that of the Argives from Argos, and that of the Danaï from Danaus; nor do the traditions of the Greeks themselves recognise any proper inhabitants of the country, of the same or an earlier æra, but the fabulous race of the Pelasgi, the men of the sea, the antediluvian possessors of the same country, (if it had any possessors before the flood,) which was peopled principally by the followers of Danaus after the Deluge. Attica in like manner had few inhabitants of its own, before the coming of Erechtheus, and the colony from Saïs which settled with him at Athens; nor did Attic tradition itself recognise any earlier possessors of the country than the fabulous contemporaries of the equally fabulous Atlantii; the former, the supposed representatives of the antediluvian possessors of Attica, and the latter those of the rest of the world. Arcadia, in like manner, must still have been destitute of inhabitants, when the colony from Area, in Palestine, settled there, and laid the foundation of the name and nation of the Arcadians of later times: and after both the coming of Danaus, and the coming of these Phœnicians, there was still room enough in the Peloponnese for a large immigration from the ancient Lydia, or Mœonia, in the persons of Pelops and his followers. sixty or seventy years later.

And as to the islands of the Ægean sea, in contradistinction to the mainland of Greece or Asia, they must have been still more imperfectly settled; for they would naturally be

the last to be occupied. And the settlers, who found their way into them first, appear to have been either the Carians, from the nearest quarter on the opposite continent of Asia, or the Phœnicians, the first of the nations of antiquity who frequented the sea, and made distant voyages from their own home. But in no instance, or in none of which any proof is in existence at present, do the first and earliest of these settlers on the islands of their own sea appear to have been native Greeks. Where, for example, was the Greek population of Crete, before the time of Minos? or what were the Ἐτεόκρητες, or aboriginal inhabitants of Crete, which Homer distinguishes from the Greek population of the island in his own time? Where was the Greek population of Rhodes, before the time of Tlepolemus? or what Greek cities had Rhodes older than the three which were founded by him? Where was the Greek population of Cyprus, before the time of Kinyras? And so, no doubt, in various other instances, of which the same question might be asked.

With regard indeed to the name and nation of the Greeks as such; from the facts which have come to our knowledge in early Hellenic antiquity, and especially from the light thrown upon it by the revelations of the primitive calendar, we can draw only one conclusion; that if they can be said to have had a beginning in history at all, it is from the date of the arrival of these different colonies, all more or less contemporaneous. And the inference from this coincidence must be *this*, That these colonies in some manner or other laid the foundation of the Greek name and nation; contributed materially at least to its development and formation by the course of subsequent events: for that the Greek nation as such, and under that name, grew up every where in the ancient Hellas out of such colonies and settlements from abroad, in every instance, is more than we would venture to affirm.

The first answer then to the question, From what quarter Cadmus probably came into Greece, is supplied by the knowledge of *this* fact, of what was going on in Egypt just at the time when he must have come into Greece. The next is supplied by another fact in his personal history, the best attested of all; that he founded a city in Greece, the name

of which was Thebes. This fact is perhaps more important and more decisive upon the question of the quarter from which he came, before he founded this city, than the other; on *one* supposition at least, the reasonableness of which *a priori* every one must allow: viz. that if he came himself from a city called Thebes, he might, and very probably would, call the city which he founded in Greece by the name of that from which he came.

For with respect to the quarter, from which he came to Greece, there have never been more than two opinions concerning it; One, that it was Phœnicia, the other, that it was Egypt. Now though the ancients enumerate nine or ten cities, in different places, of the name of Thebes, they mention none in Phœnicia; and we may take it for granted that there was no city so called in Phœnicia in particular, either in, or after, the time of Cadmus, of which anything is known either to history or to geography. It is clear then that if Cadmus gave the name of his native city, or of any city in his native country, to Bœotian Thebes, he could not have come from Phœnicia. But with respect to any city so called in Egypt, few cities could boast of a greater antiquity, none was more famous and known of out of its own country, none is earlier mentioned in ancient profane history, or earlier alluded to in the Bible, as the greatest city of its time, than Egyptian Thebes. Nothing then could be more possible *a priori* than that the name of Bœotian Thebes might have been taken from that of Egyptian Thebes; nothing would be more probable than that it would be, if the founder of Bœotian Thebes himself came from Egyptian Thebes, in his time the metropolis of Egypt, and for population, and size, and wealth, and splendour, the Paragon of cities not only in Egypt, but anywhere else in the ancient world. What but simply the feeling of patriotism, the natural pride of a native Egyptian, especially of one born and bred up in such a city, would be necessary to account for the fact that a native of Egyptian Thebes, whom circumstances had compelled to become an exile from home, should have given its name to the new abode which he was founding at a distance from it?

This consideration alone, that there was no Thebes in

Phœnicia, with which Cadmus could have had any connection, but there was a Thebes in Egypt, which no native Egyptian, much less one born in that city itself, could ever forget, ought to be decisive of the question whether Cadmus came from Phœnicia or from Egypt. And though it cannot be necessarily inferred even from this very coincidence that the founder of the Bœotian Thebes must have come from Egyptian Thebes, and not simply from Egypt in general, the testimony of the fable relating to the Dionysos of Bœotian Thebes comes in here. The author of this fable must have taken it for granted that Egyptian Thebes was the birthplace of the Dionysos of Cadmus as much as of the Dionysos of Melampus; and if so, that Cadmus himself must have come from Egyptian Thebes. And though the author of that fable is not known at present, the internal evidence of the fable itself is demonstrative of its antiquity, and of its coming so near to the time of Cadmus, that the opinions or belief of its author, on any particular fact in the history of Cadmus, must be considered a strong argument *a priori* of its truth. Besides which, we have already shewn in our *Fasti Catholici* that Egyptian Thebes derived its name from the deluge and the ark<sup>1</sup>; and that Bœotian Thebes derived its name from the deluge too—was understood at least from the first to have been closely connected with that event, and to have derived its most appropriate style and title of Ogygian Thebes from that connection\*. And this also is another strong ground

\* Among the different etymons of the name of Θήβη, or Θήβαι, which are to be met with, one is Θήβη, the supposed name of the wife of Zethus: Γαμεί δὲ Ζήθος μὲν Θήβην, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ πόλις Θήβαι<sup>1</sup>: another is Θήβα, supposed to have been the Syriac for βοῦς: Θήβα γὰρ Συριστὶ λέγεται ἡ βοῦς<sup>2</sup>—Θήβα δ' Συριστὶ λέγεται ἡ βοῦς, ὅθεν ἐκλήθησαν αἱ Θήβαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κάδμου κτισθεῖσαι—Ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς σφαγισθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ Κάδμου βοῦς φασὶ Θήβην τὴν ἐπτάπυλον κληθῆναι. Θήβη γὰρ ἡ βοῦς κατὰ Σύρου<sup>4</sup>. This etymon was evidently founded on the tradition relating to the cow, which was supposed to have guided Cadmus to the site of Thebes; and therefore had just as much foundation in point of fact as that, and no more. No such word as Θήβη occurs in the Syriac at present, (nor, as we are informed, ever did,) in the sense of a cow; and in the Phœnician, (which must have been com-

<sup>1</sup> iv. 242–250.

<sup>1</sup> Apollodorus, *Biblioth.* iii. v. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Etym. M.

<sup>2</sup> Scholia ad Phœn. 638.

<sup>4</sup> Tzetzes, ad Lycoph. 1206.

of presumption that it was purposely so called after Egyptian Thebes.

monly supposed the language of Cadmus himself,) the word for a cow, according to Plutarch<sup>5</sup>, was Θῶρ, not Θήβη\*.

As to Θήβη, the wife of Zethus, we may reasonably doubt whether such a person ever existed. Thebes itself however had been founded before the time of Zethus and Amphion, to whom, not the building of the city in general, but the building of the walls of the city in particular, was attributed: Δύο Ἀντιόπαι ἐγένοντο ἡ μὲν Νυκτέως ἡ δὲ Ἀσωποῦ (περὶ ἧς νῦν Ἀπολλώνιος), ἧς καὶ Διὸς Ἀμφίων καὶ Ζήθος, οἱ καὶ τὰς Θήβας ἐτείχισαν, ὡς Ὅμηρός φησι<sup>6</sup>.

Οἱ πρῶτοι Θήβης ἔδος ἔκτισαν ἑπταπύλοιο.

Φερεκῦδης δὲ καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν παραδίδωσι τῆς εἰκοδόμης, διότι Φλεγύας πολέμιους ὄντας εὐλαβοῦντο βασιλεύοντι Κάδμω<sup>7</sup>.

The truth is, it derived its name from the Egyptian Thebes, as that did from the name of the ark in Hebrew<sup>8</sup>: Θήβα πόλις Βοιωτίας καὶ κιβώτιον<sup>9</sup>—Ἀμεινον δ' ἠγοῦμαι τὴν κιβωτὸν ἐκ τοῦ Ἑβραϊκοῦ ὀνόματος Θήβωθα καλουμένην ἄλλο τι σημαίνειν<sup>10</sup>. The ancients enumerate *nine* cities at least of the name of Thebes<sup>11</sup>, but none older than Egyptian Thebes: Τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους παλαιστάτους εἶναι . . . φασί· καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πρώτην κτισθῆναι πόλιν Θήβας<sup>12</sup>—Τρεῖς εἰσι Θήβαι· αἱ ἑπτάπυλοι πρὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου, ἃς Κάδμος ἔκτισεν, αἱ ἑκατοντάπυλοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐξ ὧν καὶ Ὅμηρος, καὶ αἱ Ὑποπλάκιοι, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ Ἀτραμίτιον, ἣ καὶ Θήβη ἐνικῶς λέγεται<sup>13</sup>.

With respect to the epithet of the Ogygian, it is regularly applied to both Egyptian and Bœotian Thebes.

Τὰς τ' ὠγυγίους

Θήβας ἐφ' ἔπων<sup>14</sup>—

Τὰς παλαιάς· λέγει δὲ τὰς ἑκατονταπύλους<sup>15</sup>—

Ἡ μὲν ὅσοι Θήβην ἐρικυδέα ναιετάουσιν,  
Θήβην ὠγυγίην ἑκατόμπυλον, ἔνθα γεγωνῶς  
Μέμνων ἀντέλλουσαν ἐὼν ἀσπάζεται ἠῶ<sup>16</sup>—

Ὅπου σε πεισθεὶς Ὀγύγου σπαρτὸς λεῶς<sup>17</sup>—

\* Yet even Θῶρ, according to Gesenius, is not the Hebrew, but the Chaldee for βοῦς; just as in the quotation from Clemens Alex. *infra*, Θήβωθα for that of *ark*.

<sup>5</sup> Sulla, xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Odyss. A. 263.

<sup>7</sup> Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. i. 735.

Ἐν δ' ἔσαν Ἀντιόπης.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 242 sqq. also *supra*, vol. iv. 101. 367.

<sup>9</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>10</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* v. vi. § 37. p. 27. l. 28.

<sup>11</sup> Steph. Byz. in voce. cf. Eustathius, ad Dionys. Perieg. 248.

<sup>12</sup> Scholia ad Apollon. Rhod. iv.

262. Οὐδέ τί που Δαναῶν.

<sup>13</sup> Scholia in Hesiod. ad *Scutum*, 48. cf. Strabo, xiii. 1. 129 a. b. Eustathius, ad Dionys. Perieg. 855: Μέσον δὲ Φασηλίδου καὶ Ἀτταλείας Θήβη καὶ Δυρνησσὸς ἑμώνυμοι ταῖς Τρωικαῖς. cf. Strabo, xiv. 4. 218 a. b.

<sup>14</sup> Æschylus, *Persæ* 37.

<sup>15</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>16</sup> Dionys. Perieg. 248.

<sup>17</sup> Lycophron, 1206.

"Ωγυγος ἀρχαῖος βασιλεὺς Θηβῶν<sup>18</sup>, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὠγύγαι πύλαι ἐν Θήβαις. ἐκ τούτου δὲ καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὠγύγιόν φασι, διὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἀρχαιότατον· ὁ δὲ Ὀγυγος υἱὸς ἦν Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀλίστρας. Λύκος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Θηβῶν ἱστορεῖ· Μετὰ τὰ κατὰ Δευκαλίωνα Ζεὺς μίγεις Ἰοδάμα τῇ Τιθωνοῦ τοῦ Ἀμφιτρύωνος γενῆ Θήβην, ἣν δίδωσιν Ὀγύγω, ἀφ' οὗ Ὀγυγίη ἢ Θήβη. . . καὶ ὁ Ὀγυγος Θηβῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἦν βασιλεὺς, ὅθεν ὁ Κάδμος ὑπάρχων ἐλθὼν ἐν Ἑλλάδι τὰς ἐπταπύλους ἔκτισε, καὶ ὠγυγίας πύλας ἐκάλεσε, παντα ποιήσας εἰς ὄνομα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Θηβῶν—Ὀγυγος, ἀρχαῖος βασιλεὺς Θηβαίων<sup>19</sup>, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Ὀγύγαι πύλαι ἐν Θήβαις· καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὠγύγιόν φασι, διὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἀρχαιότατον—Ὀγύγια<sup>20</sup> προσηγορεύθη, φησὶν Ἀριστόδημος, διὰ τὸ τοὺς περὶ Ἀμφίωνα καὶ Ζῆθον, τειχίζοντας τὰς Θήβας, παρὰ τὸν Ὀγύγου τοῦ βασιλέως τάφον αὐτὰς τάξει. Ὀγύγια δὲ τὰ ἐν τάφῳ τοῦ Ὀγύγου βασιλέως—Ὀγυγίας δὲ τὰς Θήβας<sup>21</sup>, ἀπὸ Ὀγύγου τοῦ βασιλευσάντος αὐτῶν. Κόριννα δὲ τὸν Ὀγυγον Βοιωτοῦ υἱὸν εἶπεν. ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ ὠγύγαι τῶν Θηβῶν πύλαι.

There cannot be any doubt then that this epithet was considered to be equally applicable to both these cities, and no doubt for the same reason at bottom also. And though in the preceding statements the etymon of the epithet is traced up to the name of a person, who was supposed to have once existed, yet if we proceed to inquire who or what he was, it will soon be evident that nothing was known historically of the subject of this proper name, only of something which was supposed to have happened in his time, whatsoever that was. Tradition among the Greeks was uniform on no point of the personal history of this ancient king, but one; viz. that the oldest event, of which it had preserved the recollection in any shape, the flood of Ogygus, as it was called, happened in his reign. Tradition indeed had perpetuated the memory of three catastrophes of this kind, but of none, older or more general than this: "Ὅτι τρεῖς ἱστοροῦσι γενέσθαι κατακλυσμοὺς· πρῶτον τὸν ἐπὶ Ὀγύγου, ὅς ἦν τῆς Ἀττικῆς βασιλεὺς, δεύτερον τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος, . . . τρίτον τὸν ἐπὶ Δαρδάνου<sup>22</sup>: for a more particular description of each of which we refer the reader to Nonnus<sup>23</sup>. If the Greeks then knew anything of this ancient king, it was through the first and oldest of these deluges. And if we proceed to inquire what this particular catastrophe of that kind, so connected traditionally with this Ogygus, could have been, we soon see reason to conclude that as the first and oldest of all, as the most general and the longest in its duration of all, (nine months<sup>24</sup>, only three months less than that of the deluge of Scripture,) if it had a prototype in any real event of the same description, however far back beyond the time of the commencement of regular history, it must have been the deluge of Scripture, the flood of Noah. And if the chronologers of antiquity have attempted to assign a date to this Ogygus, and to the catastrophe which happened in his time, that too is seen to approxi-

<sup>18</sup> Tzetzes, in loc.

<sup>19</sup> Etym. M. in voce.

<sup>20</sup> Schol. ad Phœn. 1115. Ὀγύγια δ' εἰς πύλαμαθ'.

<sup>21</sup> Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. iii. 1177.

<sup>22</sup> Schol. in Platon. ii. 425. In Timæum, 12, 16.

<sup>23</sup> Dionysiaca, iii. 180-219.

<sup>24</sup> Solinus, Polyhistor, xi. 18.



mate nearer to the Scripture date of the deluge, and to the time of the patriarch Noah, than to anything else<sup>25</sup>.

And though these coincidences *prima facie* would lead to the inference that the Ogygus or Ogyges of this tradition must have been the patriarch Noah; yet if we proceed to inquire into the name which appears to have been given to him, and its probable derivation, we shall see more reason perhaps to conclude that it could never have been a proper name, strictly so called, at all; only the name of an abstract idea, that of the Ocean, as the instrumental means of the Deluge, treated as a person. For this word ὠγγυος, in the first place, is resolvable into ὠγγυ and ος, the latter of which is a mere termination, such as ὠγγυ itself would assume in the Greek language. In the next place, there is but an accidental difference between ὠγγυ and ὠῶγ (with the Æolic digamma,)—no such difference, at least, as to render it improbable, much less impossible, that ὠγγυ might have been derived from ὠῶγ. Thirdly, if we refer to Gesenius, in voce, we shall see that ὠγ or ὠῶγ, in Hebrew, is the word for “anything round, anything that went round in a circle, anything of a circular shape”—so that if the primitive idea of the ocean was that of something which went round the earth in a circle, something which encompassed the earth on all sides, ὠγ or ὠῶγ would have been a very suitable term for this primitive idea. Now there is reason to believe that *such was* the primitive idea of the ocean. We may collect for ourselves from the testimony of Scripture, that the οἰκουμένη of the antediluvian world, the Thebel of the Hebrew, in contradistinction to the Arets, was properly an island, however large—one mainland or continent at least, surrounded by the sea on all sides. And we may collect from the testimony of Homer<sup>26</sup>, and that of the most ancient geographers<sup>27</sup>, that the same belief of the earth’s being surrounded by the ocean on all sides was long retained, even in the postdiluvian world.

And as there could have been but little difference between ὠγγυ and ὠῶγ, so would there be but little between ὠγγυ and ὠγήν. Now this word too occurs in Greek, as the name of the ocean: Ὠγήν ὠκεανός<sup>28</sup>—Ὠγεῖνδαὶ ὠκεανίδαὶ ὠγήν γὰρ ὠκεανός<sup>29</sup>: and ὠγενος, which differs slightly from ὠγήν, occurs in Lycophron<sup>30</sup>:

Γραΐαν ξύνευνον Ὠγένου Τιτηνίδα

and Ὠγήνος, it appears from Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>31</sup>, was as old as the time of Pherekydes of Syros: Φερεκύδης ὁ Σύριος λέγει· Ζὰς ποιεῖ φᾶρος μέγα τε καὶ καλὸν, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ποικίλλει γῆν καὶ Ὠγήνον καὶ τὰ Ὠγήνου δώματα. And it is far from improbable that if our own term *ocean* is not to be supposed to have been derived from the Greek ὠκεανός, through the Latin *oceanus*, it is the original of this very word ὠγήν, in the form of ὠκεάν or ὠκήν itself. Such however being the probable etymon of the word, it may well be supposed that the ὠγγυος of the Greeks never could

<sup>25</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 245 note.

<sup>26</sup> *Iliad*, Ξ. 245.

<sup>27</sup> The ancient Egyptians, and Herodotus of Miletus: Herodotus, ii. 23: iv. 36: Steph. Byz. Ὠκεανός: Hesych.

Ὠκεανός: Diodor. i. 37: Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. iv. 259: Hyginus, Poet. Astron. i. 8.

<sup>28</sup> Hesychius. <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> 231. cf. Steph. Byz. in nomine.

<sup>31</sup> Strom. vi. ii. § 9. pag. 102. 22.

Lastly, with regard to the statements and testimonies of

have been any thing but this circumfluous ocean personified, and called by a proper name, derived from itself; and that the flood of this Ogygus was simply the deluge, of which this ocean, encompassing the earth on all sides, and brought up upon the earth from all sides, was made the instrument.

We may conclude with a few words relating to the gates of Thebes; one of which too was called the Ogygian gate. These gates are enumerated by Æschylus under the following names and in the following order: Προϊτίδες<sup>32</sup>: Ἡλεκτραι<sup>33</sup>: Νηϊται<sup>34</sup>: Ὀγκαΐαι<sup>35</sup>: Βορρεΐαι<sup>36</sup>: Ὀμολωΐδες<sup>37</sup>: Ἐβδόμαι<sup>38</sup>. In the Phœnissæ we have them as follows: Νηϊται<sup>39</sup>: Προϊτίδες<sup>40</sup>: Ὠγύγαι<sup>41</sup>: Ὀμολωΐδες<sup>42</sup>: Κρηναΐαι<sup>43</sup>: Ἡλεκτραι<sup>44</sup>: Ἐβδόμαι<sup>45</sup>: from which it appears that the two which Æschylus called Ὀγκαΐαι and Βορρεΐαι respectively, Euripides calls Ὠγύγαι and Κρηναΐαι. Apollodorus calls and enumerates them as follows<sup>46</sup>: Ὀμολωΐδες, Ὠγύγαι, Προϊτίδες, Ὀγκαΐδες, Ὑψίσται, Ἡλεκτραι, Κρηνίδες. Pausanias (who speaks of them as still in existence in his own time), as follows<sup>47</sup>: Ἡλεκτρίδες, Προϊτίδες, Νηϊται, Κρηναΐαι, Ὑψίσται, Ὠγύγαι, Ὀμολωΐδες: and he gives us to understand<sup>48</sup> that the gate called Ὑψίσται, in his list and that of Apollodorus, was the same which in Æschylus' and Euripides' was called Ἐβδόμαι. Lastly, they are recited by Statius also in the following manner:

Ogygiis it sorte Creon; Etheoclea mittunt  
 Neitæ, celsas Homoloidas occupat Hæmon;  
 Hypsea Præitides, celsum fudere Dryanta  
 Electræ, quatit Hypsistas manus Eurydamantis,  
 Culmina magnanimus stipat Dircæa Menoœceus<sup>49</sup>.

in which the name of Dircæan is substituted for that of Κρηναΐαι or Κρηνίδες—implying that this gate took its name from the neighbouring spring of Dirke<sup>50</sup>. The gate of Electra is mentioned by Pindar, in his account of the Heraclea at Thebes<sup>51</sup>.

Hyginus has a statement<sup>52</sup> that the walls of Thebes having been built, and the gates set up, by Amphion, these latter were called after the names of his seven daughters, Thera, Cleodoxe, Astynome, Astycratia, Chias, Ogygia, Chloris: names which, with the exception of the last but one, occur nowhere else. Nonnus on the other hand supposes that, though built by Cadmus, they were by him dedicated to, and called after, the sun and the moon and the five planets<sup>53</sup>; an hypothesis, the foundation of which (if it had one) was probably a fact in the history of the coming of Cadmus, which we shall have occasion to explain by and by.

32 Septem contra Thebas, 377.

33 Ver. 423. 34 460.

35 Ver. 486. 36 Ver. 527. the fifth.

37 Ver. 570.

38 631. cf. 789, 800: also the Scholia in locos.

39 Ver. 1104. 40 1109.

41 Ver. 1113. 42 1119.

43 1123. 44 1129. 45 1134.

46 Bibliotheca, iii. vi. 6. pag. 103.

47 ix. viii. 3. cf. vii. 4: viii. xxxiii. 1.

48 ix. xxxiv. 5.

49 Thebais, viii. 353.

50 Cf. Scholia ad Phœnissas, 1123.

51 Isthmia, iii. 104 sqq. cf. Scholia in locum, and ad Olymp. vii. 153, 154: ix. 143-148: Nemea, iv. 32: Isthmia, i. 11.

52 Fabb. lxix. Adrastus.

53 v. 67 sqq. cf. Fasti Cath. iii. 449.

antiquity itself on this question of the quarter from which Cadmus came into Greece, while we admit that, according to Herodotus and to many others, he must have come from Phœnicia—we observe also, that testimony is not wanting, and of good authority too, which deposes expressly to the fact that he came from Thebes in Egypt. And as to the manner in which those other testimonies are to be explained in order to render them consistent with this, we hope to inquire into it by and by. The testimony to which we refer is that of Diodorus more particularly—and also that of Tzetzes, and of Nonnus, author of the *Dionysiaca*.

i. Κάδμος ἐκ Θηβῶν ὄντα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων γεννηῆσαι (φασι) σὺν ἄλλοις τέκνοις καὶ Σεμέλῃν. ταύτην δὲ ὑφ' ὅτου δήποτε φθαρεῖσαν ἔγκνου γενέσθαι, καὶ τεκεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ μνηῶν διελθόντων βρέφος, τὴν ὄψιν οἶόν περ οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον Ὕσιριν γεγονέναι νομίζουσιν<sup>m</sup>—  
 ii. Ἄλλος δὲ πάλιν ἱστορικὸς λέγει ὡς Ζεὺς Θήβῃ μιγείς Αἴγυπτον γεννᾷ, ᾧ θυγάτηρ Κάρχη, ἀφ' ᾧν ἦ τε τῆς Αἰγύπτου πόλις Θήβη ἐκλήθη, καὶ ἡ Καρχηδῶν ἰήσος. καὶ ὁ Ὀλυγος Θηβῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἦν βασιλεὺς, ὅθεν ὁ Κάδμος ὑπάρχων ἐλθὼν ἐν Ἑλλάδι τὰς ἐπταπύλους ἔκτισε, καὶ Ὀλυγίους πύλας ἐκάλεσε, πάντα ποιήσας εἰς ὄνομα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Θηβῶν<sup>n</sup>.

iii. Ἦλθε καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐμὸν ῥόον, ὃν πολίηται  
 Νεῖλον ἐφημίξαντο φερώνυμον κ', τ. λ.<sup>o</sup>  
 ἔνθ' Ἐπαφον Διὶ τίκτεν, ἀκηρασίων ὅτι κόλπων  
 Ἰναχίης δαμάλης ἐπαφήσατο θεῖος ἀκοίτης  
 χερσὶν ἐρωμανέεσσι· θεηγενέος δὲ τοκῆος  
 ἐξ Ἐπάφου Λιβύῃ· Λιβύης δ' ἐπὶ παστὸν οὐδεῶν  
 Μέμφιδος ἄχρισ ἔκανε Ποσειδάων μετανάστης,  
 παρθένον ἰχνεύων Ἐπαφήϊδα· καὶ τότε κούρη  
 δεξαμένη ναετῆρα βυθοῦ χερσαῖον ὀδίτην  
 Ζῆνι Λίβυν τέκε Βῆλον, ἐμῆς ἀροτῆρα γενέθλης.  
 καὶ Διὸς Ἀσβύσταο νέην ἀντίρροπον ὄμφην  
 Χαονίη βοόωσι πελειάδι διψάδες ἄμμοι  
 μαντιπόλῳ· πέμπτῳ (leg. πέμπτων) δὲ πατὴρ ἰσόμετρον ἀριθμὸν  
 Βῆλος ἐπασσυντέρην γενεὴν σπερμήνατο παίδων  
 Φινέα καὶ Φοίνικα λιπόπτολι, οἷς ἅμα θάλλων  
 ἀστὸς ἀμοιβαίων πολίων περιφοίτος Ἀγῆνων  
 ἀσταθέος βιότοιο, πατὴρ ἐμὸς, εἶχε πορείην  
 εἰς Θήβην μετὰ Μέμφιν, εἰς Ἀσσυρίην μετὰ Θήβην<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> i. 23. cf. Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* ii. 1. 104. l. 24.

<sup>n</sup> Tzetzes, ad Lycoph. 1206.

<sup>o</sup> Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, iii. 275. Ubi Cadmus de se et parentibus suis, et

primum de Io, ad Harmoniam loquitur.

<sup>p</sup> Cf. Schol. ad Eurip. *Phœn.* 247. Κοινὸν αἷμα; and Æschylus, *Supplices*, 317. Τί' οὖν ἔτ' ἄλλον.

Ἦμος Ἀγῆνωρ

Μέμφιδος ἐνναέτης ἐκατόμπολιω ᾤκισε Θήβην 9.

Ἀλλὰ πόθον Τυρίοιο τεοῦ γενετήρος εἶσας  
μίμνε παρ' ἀλλοδάποισι, καὶ Αἴγυπτίης σέο Θήβης  
πατρίδος ἄστου πόλισσον ἐπώνυμον, ἧχι πεσοῦσα  
εὐνήσει βαρύγουνον ἐὼν πόδα δαιμονίη βοῦς 1.

Τοῖον ἔδος ποίησε, καὶ ἱερὸν ἄστου πόλισσας  
Αἴγυπτίης ἐκάλεσσαν ὁμώνυμον ἄστει Θήβης 5.

SECTION IV.—*On the probable origin of the opinion that  
Cadmus came from Phœnicia.*

The coming of Cadmus into Greece, according to the popular tradition, was connected with the Raptus of Europe; and Europe, according to the fable of the Raptus, was the daughter of Agenor, king of Tyre, and sister of Cadmus: and Cadmus, according to the fable, was sent into Greece by Agenor in search of Europe. It cannot be necessary for *our* purpose to treat such a fable as if it could have had any foundation in fact; as if Cadmus and Europe, the brother and sister of this Fable, could have been contemporaries in any sense, if Cadmus was as old as B. C. 1347, and Europe, as the mother of Minos by Zeus, could not have been older than B. C. 1260.

But though no reasonable person could doubt that it would be subversive of all the chronology of these ancient times to make Minos, (who was really contemporary with Laius, or even with Œdipus,) the contemporary of Cadmus, and 87 years older than his own Zeus; still we shall not perhaps be considered to have made good our proposition, that Cadmus actually came from Egypt, unless we can shew in what manner it might have, and probably did, come to pass that so many of the ancients, from Herodotus downwards, fell into the mistake of supposing him to have come from Phœnicia. And it appears to us that, having already, on good grounds, determined the time of his coming to B. C. 1347, we possess in that fact, and in another, inseparably connected with the same date, a clue to the whole of the mystery which has so long prevailed on this point. B. C. 1347 was the date of the

9 Nonnus, iv. 265.

1 iv. 303.

5 v. 85.

second Phœnix cycle, and of the first revision of the sphere, among the Egyptians; and if Cadmus came into Greece from Egypt in this very year, we have only to suppose that he brought with him the Phœnix period, and we shall probably assign in that coincidence all the foundation, for the popular belief of later times that he was a Phœnician, which can be required.

For it is to be observed that Cadmus is quite as often spoken of, according to this belief, as simply the Phœnician, or the son of Phœnix, as the son of Agenor: and that even Europe, his sister, is sometimes spoken of as the daughter of Phœnix, or the Phœnician too<sup>t</sup>. Now this word Phœnix, or Phœnician, Φοίνιξ in Greek, was ambiguous. It might denote the Phœnician; but it might also denote the Phœnix. It might be an appellative, and it might be a proper name. Let it only be supposed that Cadmus and the Phœnix period came into Greece together, B. C. 1347; and every one must allow it to have been possible that, by virtue of that coincidence merely, Cadmus might pass, if not with his own contemporaries, yet with posterity and long before the beginning of regular history, for Cadmus the son of Phœnix, or Cadmus the son of the Phœnician; and that it might soon be added by those who took him for a Phœnician, that his father was the king of Phœnicia.

The coming of Cadmus into Greece, B. C. 1347, approached so nearly also to the date of the introduction of the worship of Isis into Egypt, only three years before, that it may well be supposed he would bring with him, not only the knowledge of the Phœnix period, but the knowledge of Isis also: and that he did actually bring with him the knowledge and worship of some goddess, who agreed both in name and in nature with the Attic Athena, and was as old at Thebes as the foundation of that city itself, will be seen we hope by and by. At present we would direct the attention of the reader to the following passage from Pherekydes, the oldest authority on the subject of the Heroic Genealogies, next to Homer, known to the ancients, and we may add, the greatest too<sup>v</sup>: Οἱ μὲν Ἀγήνορος λέγουσι τὸν Κάδμον, οἱ δὲ Φοίνικα. Φε-

<sup>t</sup> See supra, Dissert. iii. vol. iv. 558 n.

<sup>v</sup> Scholia ad Apollion. Rhod. iii. 1185.

ρεκύδης δὲ ἐν δ' οὕτω φησίν· Ἀγήνωρ δὲ ὁ Ποσειδῶνος γαμεῖ Δαμνὸν τὴν Βήλου. τῶν δὲ γίνονται Φοῖνιξ, καὶ Ἰσαίη ἣν ἴσχει Αἴγυπτος, καὶ Μελία ἣν ἴσχει Δαναός. ἔπειτα ἐνίσχει Ἀγήνωρ Ἀργιόπην τὴν Νείλου τοῦ ποταμοῦ. τοῦ δὲ γίνεται Κάδμος. In this pedigree Cadmus is the son of Agenor, but nevertheless an Egyptian, and the brother of Phoenix and Isaia. Now what could this Φοῖνιξ and this Ἰσαίη be? Could Φοῖνιξ be any thing but the name of the Phoenix, the bird so called, simply treated as a person? or Ἰσαίη any thing but a slightly corrupted form of Ἴσις? If so, on what could the genealogical fact, that this Φοῖνιξ and this Ἰσαίη were the brother and sister of Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, have been founded, except the historical fact that Cadmus, the founder of Thebes, when he came into Greece, brought with him the Phoenix Period and the Egyptian Isis?

We were told by the Scholiast on Hesiod <sup>x</sup>, that Polydorus, the son of Cadmus, had another name also, that of Πίναξ; and the same statement occurs in the Scholia on the Phœnissæ <sup>y</sup>, with the additional information that it was a name given him by the poets, and therefore no doubt long after his birth and his true time, and as one among the other circumstances of the fabulous history of Cadmus and his family: Τοῦτον οἱ ποιηταὶ Πίνακον καλοῦσι, Πολύδωρον δὲ διὰ τὸ πολλὰ δῶρα εἰληφέναι τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ γεννήσει αὐτοῦ. What then could have been the meaning of this name of Πίναξ, especially as the proper name of a son of Cadmus who himself was a real historical character?

The proper sense of Πίναξ in Greek is that of a flat and smooth piece of wood of any kind, a board, or plank. It has likewise very commonly the sense of a writing-board, or tablet, called also Δέλτος, from its resembling in shape the letter Δ, or Delta. Hesychius explains it both by ζωγραφία, (a painting, in which sense it often occurs,) and by ἱστορία, (another common sense of the word, though entirely a secondary one,) and by ἀναγραφὴ and περιοχή; in which latter senses it would denote anything of a comprehensive nature, like a period or cycle, a certain comprehension of time and numbers.

And this leads us to observe that, as one of the senses of this word, and as the most important of all to the question

<sup>x</sup> Supra, p. 125.

<sup>y</sup> Ad vers. 8.

of the reason of its application as a proper name to the son of Cadmus in particular, it was used also by the astronomers of old, or as they were then called the astrologers, in a sense peculiar to their own art, or science; that of a scheme or delineation of the sun, the moon, and the five planets known to the ancients, with their different aspects and positions, in themselves and relatively to one another, for the purpose of casting nativities, or solving astronomical problems in general. And in this sense it is used by Plutarch, in his *Life of Romulus*, speaking of Tarrutius, the contemporary and friend of Varro; who calculated for him the nativity both of Romulus and of the city of Rome: 'Απτόμενος δὲ καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν πίνακα μεθόδου<sup>z</sup>.

It is self-evident that a chronological cycle of any kind, and especially one which was as much astronomical as chronological, would come under this description; such, for instance, as the representation of the sphere of Mazzaroth, or the scheme of the Phœnix period, in which three different kinds of time, mean Julian, mean tropical, and mean lunar, were combined perpetually in a certain recurring cycle, of which we have given an account in our *Fasti Catholica*<sup>a</sup>. And it is evident also that to such a representation as this, Hesychius' gloss on Πίναξ of ἀναγραφῆ, or περιοχῆ, would be strictly applicable. It is therefore a probable explanation of the application of this name to the son of Cadmus, that, when Cadmus came into Greece, he brought with him both the sphere of Mazzaroth, and the Phœnix cycle; each of which would require to be delineated in a Πίναξ of this kind. Nor would it be more extraordinary that from this coincidence his son should have been called Πίναξ, than that he himself, from the very same coincidence, should have been called Φοῖνιξ; especially, if it so happened, (as it might have done, and as it seems actually to have done,) that the birth of his son itself, and this introduction of the sphere and the Phœnix cycle into Greece by him, fell out together.

Moreover, as the common opinion in modern times, that Cadmus originally came from Phœnicia, is founded at bottom on the common opinion also, implicitly received by the

<sup>z</sup> See our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*, iii. 172.

<sup>a</sup> iii. 499 sqq. cf. 305.

learned from time immemorial, that Cadmus was the first person who brought the alphabet into Greece, and that the alphabet which Cadmus brought was the Phœnician; the account, which we have just given of the probable reason of the application of this name of Πίναξ to his son, enables us to dispose of this prejudice too. The oldest authority for this statement is Herodotus': and yet Herodotus says no more than that Cadmus brought into Greece τὰ Φοινικῆία γράμματα<sup>b</sup>; though we are ready to admit that by these Φοινικῆία γράμματα he himself meant the Phœnician alphabet. But if Cadmus really brought the Phœnix cycle and the Phœnix period when he first came into Greece, he brought the Phœnix tables<sup>c</sup>; and what could the Phœnix tables have been called in Greek but the Φοινίκεα γράμματα? and how easily that might have been confounded with the Phœnician letters, in the sense of the alphabet, long before the time of Herodotus, when all that might once have been known among the Greeks of the sphere of Cadmus, and of the Phœnix cycle of Cadmus, might have been forgotten, and nothing remembered in connection with them except the simple fact that he brought the Φοινίκεα γράμματα with him, we need not stop to shew. This is in all probability the true explanation of the mistake of Herodotus on this point, and therefore of the foundation of all the prejudice which has so long existed in modern times; to which nothing has been so instrumental as this testimony of Herodotus.

SECTION V.—*On the Fable of the Dragon of Cadmus; of the teeth of the Dragon; and of the Sparti or sown men. Testimonies.*

Among the fables of antiquity none was ever more famous than this of the Dragon, and the teeth of the Dragon, and of the Sparti or sown men, which tradition connected with the coming of Cadmus to Bœotia, and the foundation of the city of Thebes; except perhaps the cognate fable of the Dragon of Æetes, the Argonautic Expedition, and the Golden Fleece: and none at first sight might seem to be more incapable of any rational and consistent explanation. But we have learnt

<sup>b</sup> v. 58. cf. Hesychius, Φοινικῆία γράμματα, et Suidas, Γράμματα: Φοινικῆία γράμματα.

<sup>c</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 499-551.



from experience to distrust the impressions produced by the *prima facie* view of these ancient fables; or rather, the more extravagant and absurd they appear externally, the more persuaded we are that they were founded on something, which though curious, recondite, and purposely concealed, was nevertheless very possible and very true. Let us therefore begin with collecting some of the testimonies of classical antiquity to this fable in particular; and then proceed to examine and explain them.

i. Κάδμος ἔμολε τάνδε γὰν  
 Τύριος, ᾧ τετρασχελῆς  
 μόςχος ἀδάματον πέσημα  
 δίκη, τελεσφόρον διδοῦσα  
 χρησμὸν οὗ κατοικίσει  
 πεδία μὲν τὸ θέσφατον  
 χρῆσε πυροφόρ' Ἀόνων,  
 καλλιπότημος ὕδατος ἵνα τε  
 νοτὶς ἐπέρχεται γύας  
 Δίρκης χλοηφόρους  
 καὶ βαθυσπόρους.

.. ..

ἔνθα φόνιος ἦν δράκων,  
 Ἄρεος ὠμόφρων φύλαξ,  
 νάματ' ἔνυδρα καὶ ῥέεθρα  
 χλοερά δεργμάτων κόραισι  
 πολυπλάνοις ἐπισκοπῶν  
 ὄν ἐπὶ χέρνιβος μολῶν  
 Κάδμος ὤλεσε μαρμάρῳ,  
 κρᾶτα φόνιον ὀλεσίθηρος  
 ὠλένας δικῶν βολαῖς,  
 δίας ἀμάτορος  
 Παλλάδος φραδαῖς  
 γαπετεῖς δικῶν ὀδόντας  
 ἐς βαθυσπόρους γύας  
 ἔνθεν ἐξανῆκε γὰ  
 πάνοπλον ὕψιν ὑπὲρ ἄκρων  
 ὄρων χθονός· σιδαρόφρων  
 δέ νιν φόνος πάλιν ξυνῆψε γὰ φίλα,  
 αἵματος δ' ἔδευσε γαίαν, ἃ νιν εὐεί-  
 λοισι δεῖξεν αἰθέρος πνοαῖς <sup>d</sup>.

ii. Κάδμος δὲ... ἦλθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς περὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης πυνθανόμενος, ὃ δὲ θεὸς εἶπε περὶ μὲν Εὐρώπης μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν· χρῆσθαι δὲ καθοδηγῶ βοῖ, καὶ πόλιν κτίξειν ἔνθα ἂν αὐτὴ πέση καμοῦσα.

<sup>d</sup> Phoenissæ, 638. cf. ad 1060.

τοιούτων λαβῶν χρησμὸν διὰ Φωκέων ἐπορεύετο· εἶτα βοὴ συντυ-  
χῶν ἐν τοῖς Πελάγοντος βουκολίαις, ταύτη μετόπισθεν εἶπετο. ἡ δὲ  
διεξιούσα Βοιωτίαν ἐκλίθη πόλις ἔνθα νῦν εἰσὶ Θήβαι. βουλόμενος  
δὲ Ἄθηνᾶ καταθῦσαι τὴν βουὴν πέμπει τιὰ τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ληψό-  
μενον ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείας κρήνης ὕδωρ· φρουρῶν δὲ τὴν κρήνην δράκων,  
ὃν ἐξ Ἄρεος εἶπόν τινας γεγενῆσθαι, τοὺς πλείονας τῶν πεμφθέντων  
διέφθειρεν. ἀγαρακτῆσας δὲ Κάδμος κτείνει τὸν δράκοντα, καὶ τῆς  
Ἄθηνᾶς ὑποθεμένης τοὺς ὁδοίτας αὐτοῦ σπείρει. τούτων δὲ σπαρέν-  
των, ἀνέτειλαν ἐκ γῆς ἄνδρες ἔνοπλοι, οὓς ἐκάλεσαν Σπαρτούς.  
οὔτοι δὲ ἀπέκτειναν ἀλλήλους. . . . Φερεκύδης δὲ φησιν ὅτι Κάδμος,  
ιδὼν ἐκ γῆς ἀναφνομένους ἄνδρας ἐνόπλους, ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔβαλε λίθους·  
οἱ δὲ ὑπ' ἀλλήλων νομίζοντες βάλλεσθαι εἰς μαχὴν κατέστησαν.  
περιεσώθησαν δὲ πέντε, Ἐχίων, Οὐδαῖος, Χθόνιος, Ὑπερίνωρ, Πέ-  
λωρ. Κάδμος δὲ, ἀνθ' ὧν ἔκτεινεν, αἰδίου ἐνιαυτὸν ἐθήτευσεν Ἄρει.  
ἦν δὲ ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς τότε ὀκτῶ ἔτη<sup>ε</sup>.

iii. Οἱ περιλειφθέντες τῶν Σπαρτῶν ὡς Αἰσχύλος φησὶν ἦσαν  
Χθόνιος Οὐδαῖος Πέλωρος Ὑπερίνωρ καὶ Ἐχίων, ὃς ἐγγημεν Ἀγαυὴν  
τὴν Κάδμου θυγατέρα, ἐξ ἧς ποιεῖ Πενθέα οὐ \*οκλασος, οὐ Μενου-  
κεὺς, οὐ Κρέων καὶ Ἰοκάστη<sup>φ</sup>.

iv.

Πόρε δέ σφιν ἰοῦσιν

Κρείων Αἰήτης χαλεποὺς ἐς ἄεθλον ὁδόντας  
Ἄουῖοιο δράκοντος, ὃν ὠγγυγίη ἐνὶ Θήβῃ  
Κάδμος, ὅτ' Εὐρώπην διζήμενος εἰσαφίκανε,  
πέφνεν Ἀρητιάδῃ κρήνῃ ἐπίουρον ἔοντα.  
ἔνθα καὶ ἐννάσθη πομπῇ βοός, ἦν οἱ Ἀπόλλων  
ᾤπασε μαντοσύνησι προηγητέϊραν ὁδοῖο<sup>ε</sup>.

Ἄγγυγιος δὲ τὰς Θήβας (εἶπεν) ἀπ' Ἄγγυγου τοῦ βασιλεύσαντος  
αὐτῶν. . . . ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ καὶ Ἄγγυγίαι τῶν Θηβῶν πύλαι. περὶ δὲ  
Εὐρώπης καὶ τῆς Κάδμου εἰς Θήβας παρουσίας Λυσίμαχος ἐν τῇ  
πρώτῃ τῶν Θηβαϊκῶν παραδόξως συνείλεχε πολλὴν τὴν ὕλην (καὶ)  
διαφωνοῦσαν. . . . καὶ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν Ἀΐ Φορωνίδος· ἱστορῶν ὅτι καὶ  
τοὺς ὁδόντας ἔσπειρε τοῦ δράκοντος κατὰ Ἄρεος βούλησιν· καὶ  
ἐγένοντο πέντε ἄνδρες ἔνοπλοι, Οὐδαῖος Χθόνιος Πέλωρ Ὑπερίνωρ  
Ἐχίων<sup>h</sup>. . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς Μουσαίου Τιτανογραφίας λέγεται  
ὡς Κάδμος ἐκ τοῦ Δελφικοῦ ἐπορεύετο προκαθηγουμένης αὐτῷ τῆς  
βοός<sup>i</sup>.

\* Forsan ὁ Λύκος, see supra, 126 note f, though Ὀκλασος might be derivable  
from the ὄκλασις of the cow of Cadmus:

<sup>ε</sup> Apollodorus, iii. iv. 1. cf. Schol.  
in *Iliad*. B. 494.

<sup>φ</sup> Schol. in *Phoenissas*, 942. *Λοιπὸς*  
*εἰ Σπαρτῶν γένους.* cf. ad 934 and  
1008: also, in *Pindar. Isthm.* i. 41.  
*Σπαρτῶν γένει.*

<sup>ε</sup> Apollonius Rhod. iii. 1175.

<sup>h</sup> Cf. ad vers. 1185.

<sup>i</sup> Schol. in loc. cf. *Photii Biblio-*  
*theca*, Codex 186. *Conon, Δηγήσεων*  
*λζ'.*

SECTION VI.—*Explanation of the Fable.*

i. The idea of the Dragon or that of the Serpent, (between which there is only a specific difference,) appears to have been conceived by the ancient Egyptians in a figurative or symbolical sense, first as the type of time, in contradistinction to duration; i. e. of duration, which some time or other had a beginning, though it might not have an end<sup>k</sup>. Secondly, as the type of a cycle, or duration in the sense of time broken into segments; always ending and always beginning again according to some uniform law<sup>l</sup>. Thirdly, as the type of the sphere<sup>m</sup>, or a cycle of a certain kind too; the cycle of the ecliptic, the round of the sun in the heavens, measured either by the tropical or by the sidereal year. It is sufficient therefore to explain the first conception of this idea of the Dragon of Cadmus also to know that Cadmus brought a sphere of a certain kind into Greece. The Dragon of Cadmus was this sphere of Cadmus; and if the sphere of Cadmus was the Mazzaroth sphere of the Egyptians, the Dragon of Cadmus was this Mazzaroth sphere of Cadmus.

ii. The Dragon of Cadmus was sacred to Mars: and from the time of the introduction of the doctrine of the Decani of the sphere and of the planetary houses<sup>n</sup>, the sphere of Mazzaroth also was sacred to the planet Mars. The principal sign of the sphere of Mazzaroth was the Krion of Mazzaroth; and the principal Decan in the sign of Krion was the planet Mars, and the first house in that sign was the house of Mars<sup>o</sup>.

iii. The death of the Dragon of the fable was only preliminary to the effect, supposed to have followed upon it; and therefore merely *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*. The Dragon is killed in order that the teeth of the dragon may be sown; the teeth are sown in order that they may spring up in the form of armed men; these armed men spring up in order to contend together; they contend together in order that a certain number of them may be killed, and so perish for ever, and a certain number may survive, for any use and purpose which was afterwards to be made of them. The Dragon of Cadmus

<sup>k</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 177, note.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 483-498.

<sup>l</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>m</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 409.

<sup>o</sup> See *Ibid.* 487, 496.

therefore denoting the sphere of Cadmus, and the sphere of Cadmus denoting the Mazzaroth sphere of the Egyptians, the teeth of this Dragon must have been some part or other of this sphere. The only question will be, What part ?

iv. The idea of the sphere of Mazzaroth was conceived by the Egyptians along with that of the tropical sphere ; but so that the latter was subordinated to the former, the sphere of Mazzaroth was intended to serve as the standard of reference of the tropical. And the sphere of Mazzaroth being an invariable idea of its kind, but the tropical or natural one, a variable one, liable to be affected by precession, and to recede in terms of the sphere of Mazzaroth, perpetually ; there were necessarily in the course of time three Types of these two spheres, adapted to three different states of their relations one to the other. i. The Type of the epoch, in which the tropical sphere was laid down in the *fifteenth* degrees of the sphere of Mazzaroth, in each of the signs ; ii. the Type of the first revision, at the end of the first Phœnix Period, in which it was laid down in the *twelfth* degrees ; iii. the Type of the second revision, at the end of the second Period, in which it was laid down in the eighth degrees P.

v. These distinctions then, and the reasons on which they were founded, being understood, the inference from them is obvious ; viz. That the Dragon of Cadmus denoting the sphere of Cadmus, and the sphere of Cadmus the sphere of Mazzaroth, the teeth of the Dragon must have been the *degrees* of the sphere of Mazzaroth ; that part of the sphere of Mazzaroth by which it was connected with the tropical sphere perpetually. To adopt the symbolical language of the fable, and to apply it to each of the above distinctions ; the idea denoted by the Dragon in every case remaining the same, and in every case that of the sphere of Mazzaroth in general in a certain relation to the sphere of nature in particular, the sphere of the first Type was a Dragon of *fifteen* teeth, the sphere of the second was a Dragon of *twelve* teeth, and the sphere of the third was a Dragon of *eight* teeth. Under one or other of these categories consequently must the sphere of Cadmus also have come ; for that too was a

p See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 280 sqq. : 349 sqq. : 420 sqq. : and our *Origines Kalendarie Italicæ*, iv. 56 n. sqq.

Dragon with a certain number of teeth : and if we knew the number of the teeth of the Dragon of Cadmus, we should know the Type of the sphere of Cadmus also.

vi. Now though the number of the teeth of the Dragon collectively, including those which perished and those which survived alike, is not mentioned in any of the accounts as yet quoted, there is one more allusion to the same story which we have not yet produced, in which this omission is virtually supplied: Ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων ἐξεκύησει ἡ γῆ ὀπλοφόρους αἰδρας· εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι (οἱ) ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑπολειφθέντες, Πέλωρ, Ἐχίων, Οἰδαῖος, Χθόριος, Ἵπερήνωρ, κατὰ δὲ Τίμαγοραν καὶ Κρέων ... ὁ μὲν Στησίχορος ἐν Εἰρωπείᾳ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἐσπαρκέναι τοὺς ὀδόντας φησίν· ὁ δὲ Ἀνδροτίων σπαρτοὺς αὐτοὺς φησι διὰ τὸ ἀκολουθήσαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ Φοινίκης Κάδμου σποράδην οἰκίσαι· Ἀμφίλοχος δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐπεσπάρθαι τοῖς οἰκοῦσιν ἐν Θήβαις Διονύσιος δὲ ἔθνος Βοιωτίας αὐτοὺς φησιν. ἔτιοι δὲ παῖδας Κάδμου αὐτοὺς φασιν, ἐκ διαφόρων γυναικῶν, γ' τὸν ἀριθμόν. This last statement, that these Sparti, according to some, (and doubtless the best informed of all these authorities,) were so many children of Cadmus by different wives, and *thirteen* in number, is of great importance to this question of the number of the teeth of the Dragon in all. It is a necessary inference from it that as the children of these wives of Cadmus, so the Sparti themselves, were thirteen in number ; and if so, the number of the teeth of the Dragon must have been thirteen too. It follows that the Dragon of Cadmus was a Dragon of thirteen teeth ; and consequently the sphere of Cadmus was a combination of the tropical sphere with the sphere of Mazzaroth in the thirteenth degrees ; or if we will, the tropical sphere laid down in the sphere of Mazzaroth in the thirteenth degrees.

vii. It is manifest therefore that there was little difference between the sphere of Cadmus and the Mazzaroth sphere of the second Type ; not more than one degree : the latter being combined with the tropical sphere in the twelfth degrees, the former in the thirteenth. And yet even this is a greater degree of difference than under the circumstances of the case would be admissible—if the Mazzaroth sphere of the

1 Schol. ad Phoen. 670. Ἐνθεν ἐξανῆκε γῆ.

second Type at least must have been that which Cadmus himself brought into Greece. We must therefore endeavour to explain it; and shew, if possible, in what manner it might have come to pass that, though the true sphere of Cadmus must have been laid down in the twelfth degrees, it might have been assumed by the author of this fable as laid down one degree higher.

viii. We observe then that fifty years after the second revision of the sphere, which left the tropical laid down, as the nature of the case at the time, and the proper rule of the administration of the two spheres in conjunction until then, required, in the 8th degrees of the sphere of Mazzaroth; the doctrine of the recession of the cardinal points eight degrees *in antecedentia*, and that of the precession eight degrees *in consequentia*, alternately, was introduced into Egypt, and apparently from Chaldæa<sup>r</sup>: and the rate both of this recession and of this precession being assumed at one degree in eighty years, the Period was naturally assumed at  $80 \times 8$  or 640 years. Six hundred and forty years, according to this theory, was the natural length of time during which the motion *in antecedentia*, contrary to the order of the signs, and contrary to the apparent motion of the fixed stars, from the eighth degree to the first, would attain to its maximum in that direction; and the natural length of time in which the motion *in consequentia*, by which it was to be followed, agreeably to the order of the signs and to the apparent motion of the fixed stars, from the first degree to the eighth, would reach its maximum in that direction.

ix. It is manifest that wheresoever this doctrine was received, the motion in either direction must have been considered limited to eight degrees; and such a theory and doctrine as that being applied to a combination of the tropical sphere with the sphere of Mazzaroth, so made that the former was laid down in the thirteenth degrees of the latter, the practical effect of the theory, under such circumstances, would be, that the first point of the tropical sphere would be liable to recede from the thirteenth to the fifth degree in

<sup>r</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 439; and our *Origines Kalendarie Italicæ*, iv. 56 n. sqq.: 165 n. sqq.

the sphere of Mazzaroth, but no further : that consequently, the first eight degrees in such a sphere, from the thirteenth to the fifth, would be liable to be absorbed in the recession *in antecedentia*, and lost ; but not the remaining five, from the end of the sixth to the end of the first. These five degrees, on the principles of the theory, could never be affected by the recession. The first point of the tropical sphere could never approach nearer to the first point of the sphere of Mazzaroth than these five degrees. These five degrees must always remain a part of the sphere of Mazzaroth ; and could never be swallowed up or lost in the tropical.

x. Now the total number of the teeth of the Dragon being supposed to have been *thirteen*, and the number of those, which survived the contest among themselves, according to all our authorities having been five ; the number which perished must have been the difference of thirteen and five, i. e. eight. It is manifest therefore that the teeth of the Dragon, thirteen in all, must have been supposed in the fable to have been made up of two parts, eight and five, respectively ; the distinction between which must have been assumed to be *this*, That though they had both a common origin, and were each of them teeth of the Dragon alike, the part made up of the eight was liable to perish and be lost, the part made up of the five was not.

xi. It follows that the fable, in its first conception, and according to the views and assumptions of its author, whosoever he was, could have been nothing more nor less than the doctrine of the recession and the precession, which we have just explained, applied to a sphere, which was either that of Cadmus, or assumed by this author to have been so ; a sphere, laid down originally in the thirteenth degrees, but by virtue of the alternation in question liable to be reduced to the fifth degrees, but no further. The symbolical language of the fable on this principle is easily understood. The Dragon of the fable, at first, with his 13 teeth, was the sphere of nature laid down in the thirteenth degrees of the sphere of Mazzaroth, but subject to this law of the recession. The same Dragon, at last, with his five teeth, was the same sphere, affected by the recession to the extent prescribed by its own law, but no further. And on this principle too, the very cir-

cumstances and suppositions of the fable serve as a clue to the time when it must have been invented, and consequently to the age of its author.

xii. For, as it supposes eight of the teeth of the Dragon to have been lost to the Dragon, and five only to remain to it, it must have been adapted to the hypothesis that at the time when it was invented the recession had reached the maximum of eight degrees, and therefore that the sphere in question, which was the proper subject of this affection, was 640 years old, when this fable was invented. And this conclusion applied to the true time of Cadmus, B. C. 1347, would give the time of the author of this fable, B. C. 1347—640, or B. C. 707, at which time the doctrine of the recession and precession in question, which was first broached in Egypt B. C. 798, might have been very generally known of elsewhere. But the true sphere of Cadmus, as the sphere of the epoch of B. C. 1347, must have been laid down in the twelfth degrees; and eight degrees of a sphere of that kind being supposed to be liable to perish, four only could be supposed to be always in reserve and remaining. It is manifest therefore that the sphere of this fable could not have been the true sphere of Cadmus, however nearly it might have approached to an identity with it; but a sphere laid down one degree higher in terms of the sphere of Mazzaroth, in the 13th degrees instead of the 12th. And a difference of one degree in the graduation of the sphere, on the principles of the doctrine in question, making a difference of 80 years in the epoch of the sphere, the epoch of this sphere of Cadmus, and consequently the age of Cadmus, must have been assumed by the author of the fable just 80 years earlier than B. C. 1347, i. e. B. C. 1427; and this being 640 years before his own time, it will give his own time B. C. 787, instead of B. C. 707.

xiii. Now the first confirmation of this conclusion is the fact that even this date, B. C. 787, was eleven years later than B. C. 798, when the doctrine of the recession and precession in question, and that of the planetary houses, and that of the decans of the sphere, (all which appear to have been known to the author of the fable,) were first introduced into Egypt<sup>s</sup>. The next is, that it comes very near the date

<sup>s</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 439 sqq.



which is assigned by Eusebius to Eumelus, of Corinth\*, the oldest of the poets whose names have been handed down as those of the authors of an *Εὐρωπεία*, (or *Εὐρωπία*.) a poem on the Rape of Europe, and the fables connected with that subject, of which number the adventures of Cadmus and the foundation of Thebes made part. The third is that the date, which the author must thus have assumed for the time of Cadmus, is very nearly the same which the chronologers of antiquity assigned it. For though the Parian Chronicle dates his coming into Greece under the viith epoch, B. C. 1519, (almost two hundred years too high,) Eusebius<sup>t</sup> and Jerome<sup>v</sup> date the beginning of his reign at Thebes itself ad ann. 587, i. e. 653 years before the first Olympiad, B. C. 1429, only two years earlier than this author's date, B. C. 1427 †.

\* Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ad ann. 1272. Olymp. ix. 1: Eumelus Corinthius versificator florebat. cf. Thesaurus Temp. Ol. x. 1. ad Ann. 1278, and Ol. iii. 2. ad Ann. 1250: Eumelus Poeta, qui Bugoniam et Europiam. . . composuit, &c. That Eumelus was the author of an *Ευροπία*, see the Schol. ad Iliad. Z. 131: Pausanias, ix. v. 4. Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. i. xxi. § 131. p. 89. l. 2.) makes him contemporary with Archias, the founder of Syracuse, (i. e. B. C. 734. cf. Mr. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici in anno*): cf. vi. ii. § 11. 103. 17: § 26. 112. 30.

Pausanias speaks of an Eumelus (v. xix. 2.) as the author of the *Ἐπιγράμματα*, or Inscriptions, on the chest of Kypselus, at Elis, (v. xvii. 2-xix. 1.) which would be too late for the time of the above Eumelus. But elsewhere he recognises nothing of Eumelus' as genuine, except an *ᾄσμα προσόδιον*, (*προσῳδίων*, cf. v. xix. 2.) as he terms it, written by him for the Messenians, when they sent a *χορὸς ἀνδρῶν* for the first time, in the time of Phintias, son of Sybotus, seventh in descent from Cresphontes, to Delos: iv. iv. 1. cf. iii. 4-6: xxiii. 3: v. xix. 1. also ii. 1. 1.

Cf. Mr. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, ad ann. 761. 744. Also, Mure, *History of Greek Literature*, ii. 263, 264. 448.

† With respect to the opinion of Herodotus on this point, it is well known that he dates the time of Dionysos, the son of Semele, about 1600 years before his own (ii. 145): *Κατὰ ἐξηκόσια ἔτεα καὶ χίλια μάλιστα*: as he does that of Hercules 900 years, and that of the war of Troy, 800 before his own time respectively. Now as the birth of Dionysos could not have been many years later than the coming of Cadmus into Greece, this would make Cadmus 700 years (21 generations, cf. ii. 142.) older than Hercules, and 800 years, or 24 generations, older than the war of Troy; which is so great an anachronism, that the learned are more inclined to

<sup>t</sup> In *Chronico Arm. Lat.* ii. 113.

<sup>v</sup> *Thesaurus Temporum.*

SECTION VII.—*On the Oracle given to Cadmus, and on the Cow of Cadmus.*

Of the circumstances which were supposed to have preceded the foundation of Thebes, and handed down by tradition accordingly, the most remarkable were three—the oracle, said to have been given to Cadmus; the cow, which was said to have conducted him to the site of the future city; and the part ascribed to the tutelary genius of Cadmus himself, which tradition delivered under the name of Ὀγκα, or Ὀγκαία, yet as the same in other respects with the Athena of the rest of the Greeks.

suspect some error of reading in the text of Herodotus at present, than to suppose he himself could have fallen into it: see Wesseling, in loc. And though they propose to correct the text by reading *κατὰ ἐξήκοντα ἔτη καὶ χίλια*, instead of *κατὰ ἐξακόσια ἔτη καὶ χίλια*, it is more probable perhaps that the true reading was simply *κατὰ χίλια ἔτη*, and that X, the first letter of the *χίλια*, having been mistaken for the numeral 600, the present reading grew out of that mistake. Supposing Herodotus' own time to have been B. C. 456, (cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 196.) a thousand years before that would give the time of Dionysos, and consequently of Cadmus, B. C. 1456, sufficiently close to the date of the author of the fable, B. C. 1427.

It is observable however that the calculations of some of the chronologers of antiquity, on such points as these of the ἀποθέωσις, or recognition of the divinity, of Dionysos, &c. the determination of which includes the time of Cadmus also, came remarkably near the truth. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i. xxi. 105. pag. 74) gives us a calculation of this kind from Apollodorus, of which the following is an abstract. (cf. 137. p. 92.)

From the apotheosis of Dionysos to the Argonautic expedition .. .. .	63 years.
From the Argonautic expedition to the apotheosis of Hercules .. .. .	38
From the apotheosis of Hercules to the capture of Troy .. .. .	53
	<hr/>
	154
Capture of Troy, according to Apollodorus B. C.	1184
	<hr/>
Apotheosis of Dionysos, and consequently time of Cadmus .. .. .	B. C. 1338

which is only nine years later than the coming of Cadmus into Greece, and the recognition of the divinity of Dionysos, according to the fable considered supra, B. C. 1347.

Now with regard to the oracle, it was supposed to have been received from the Pythian Apollo at Delphi; and neither of these having yet come into existence in the time of Cadmus, it is impossible that any such circumstance could have made part of the first and most authentic tradition on this subject. It must have been the invention of a time when the Pythian Apollo and the Delphian oracle were not only in being, but already possessed of so much credit and authority, that no business of any importance, like the planting of a colony, or the foundation of a city, could be supposed undertaken anywhere among the Greeks without first consulting them.

With regard to the cow; this circumstance of the traditionary account of the foundation, in the form in which it has come down to us, is inseparably connected with the last. It was part of the oracle, that Cadmus was to discover this cow in a particular quarter, and to make use of the discovery for the foundation of the city in a particular manner; both specified by the oracle. Now these two things were not necessarily connected. There might have been a tradition relating to the cow, before there was one relating to the oracle; and it is very conceivable that the latter might even have grown up out of the former. We may be sure at least that so material a circumstance in the history of the foundation of Thebes, as that of the mode in which its actual site was made known to its founder, would not be omitted in the first and earliest accounts thereof.

This tradition, concerning the cow, appears in most of the testimonies produced *supra*<sup>x</sup>, beginning with that of Euripides; and it may be inferred from all of them together that Cadmus was supposed to have heard of this cow first at Delphi, but to have found it first somewhere else on the road from Delphi to Thebes\*; that this cow was supposed to

\* The oracle, as it will appear by and by, is supposed to have commanded Cadmus to begin his journey from Delphi in search of the cow, in the morning, and then having found it, to continue his route to Thebes, preceded by it. Now Delphi was fifty-seven Roman miles distant from Thebes, even in a straight line, and that would require two or three days' journey at least. Plutarch (*Sulla*, xvii.) mentions a local tradition of

have preceded him, without stopping, as far as Thebes, and to have halted there first, and to have laid itself down on a certain spot, which was either the site of Thebes, or comprehended within it. The conjunction therefore of the two traditions, that of the oracle and that of the cow, must have been made long before the oldest of the allusions to them which are any where on record at present. Let us then produce the oracle itself; which has been preserved in the Scholia on the same testimony of Euripides in the *Phœnissæ* y—

Κάδμος ζητῶν τὴν ἀδελφὴν Εὐρώπην μαιτεῖον ἔλαβε, περὶ αὐτῆς οὐδὲν αὐτῷ σημαῖνον, ἀλλ' ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐξελθόντα ἔπεςθαι βοῦν, καὶ οὐ δ' ἂν αὐτόματος πέσῃ κτίζειν πόλιν. ἔχει δὲ ὁ χρησμὸς τοῦ Πυθίου οὕτως·

Φράξο δὴ μοι μῦθον Ἀγήνορος ἔγγογε Κάδμε,  
 ἦοὺς ἐγρόμενος προλιπὼν ἴθι Πυθῶ διαν,  
 ἦθάδ' ἔχων ἐσθῆτα καὶ αἰγανήν μετὰ χερσὶ,  
 τὴν διὰ τε Φλεγύων καὶ Φωκίδος, ἔς τ' ἂν ἵκηαι  
 βούκολον ἠδὲ βόας κηριτρεφέος Πελάγοντος·  
 ἐνθάδε προσπελάσας ξυλλάμβανε βοῦν ἐρίμυκον,  
 τὴν ἣ κεν νότοισιν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔχησι  
 λευκὸν σῆμ' ἐκάτερθε περίτροχον, ἠὔτε μήνης·  
 τὴν δέ σύ γ' ἡγεμόνα σχεῖ περιτρίπτοιο κελεύθου·  
 σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω μάλ' ἀριφραδὲς, οὐδέ σε λήσει·  
 ἔνθα κέ τοι πρῶτιστα βοὸς κέρας ἀγραύλοιο  
 ἴζηται, κλίνη τε πέδῳ γόνυ ποιήεντι,  
 καὶ τότε τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα μελαμφύλλῳ χθονὶ ῥέξειν,  
 ἀγνώως καὶ καθαρῶς· γαίῃ δ' ὅταν ἱερὰ ῥέξῃς  
 ὄχθῳ ἔπ' ἀκροτάτῳ κτίζειν πόλιν εὐρύαγυιαν,  
 δεινὸν Ἐνναλίον πέμψας φύλακ' Ἀΐδος εἴσω.  
 καὶ σύ γ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις ὀνομάκλυτος ἔσσειαι αὖθις,  
 ἀθανάτων λεχέων ἀντήσας, ὄλβιε Κάδμε z.

Chæronea, that Cadmus found his cow there; and Chæronea being half-way from Delphi to Thebes, this might have been purposely imagined, in order that Cadmus and the cow might get to Thebes in one day after the discovery—yet journey together continuously no longer than from the morning to the evening of this one day. That they must have been supposed to have arrived at their journey's end towards the evening at least, appears from the fact, that Cadmus sends or goes to the spring Dirke, for water, as soon as he arrives; which leads to his encounter with the dragon there: and to fetch water for any purpose was usually the work of the morning or the evening of a given day. See our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels,

Τὰτα ἀκούσας ὁ Κάδμος ἀφίκετο εἰς τὸ βουκόλιον τοῦ Πελάγοντος τοῦ Ἀμφιδάμαντος, παρ' οὗ ἀγοράσας βοῦν, καὶ ἡγεμόνα ταύτην τῆς ὁδοῦ ποιησάμενος, κτίζει τὰς Θήβας, ὁμωνύμους τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Θηβῶν, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἀρέκαθεν Αἰγύπτως ἦν ὁ Κάδμος· καὶ ἡ Βοιωτία δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς βοῦς ἐκλήθη.

The first remark which may be made on this account is that as none other is found upon record substantially different from it, and everything is contained in this oracle, which appears in every other allusion to the traditionary circumstances of the foundation of Thebes, we may presume that all the circumstances, so handed down, having been previously embodied in this oracular representation of them, long before the oldest of the references to them which occur any where else in Grecian antiquity, this oracle in reality was the foundation of all those subsequent allusions to these things.

The next is, that not only the tradition relating to the cow, which was destined to serve as the guide to the site of the future city, but the tradition relating to the Dragon also, is recognised in this oracle; for it clearly appears from it that Cadmus, even after he had discovered the site of the city, could not lay the foundation, until he had killed some *warder of Mars*; which could have been nothing but the Dragon, sacred to Mars, and the guardian of the spring of Derke, also sacred to Mars. But there is no reference to the teeth of the Dragon, or to the sowing of those teeth, in this oracle; and according to the common tradition on that subject, to sow the teeth of the Dragon, after he had killed it, was a direction which Cadmus received from Athena, his guardian genius, not from Apollo; and the oracle was careful to observe that distinction, and not to anticipate anything in the name of Apollo, which was to be specially reserved for Athena. We may infer from these coincidences, that unless all these traditions, relating to the foundation of Thebes, (that of the cow, that of the Dragon and of the teeth of the Dragon, and that of the oracle,) were necessarily so connected with each other that they must all have come into existence together, this in particular, relating to the oracle, must have

Thirdly, it is very observable that the cow, which was predestined to act so important a part in the œconomy of the foundation of Thebes, was to be found only in a particular quarter, and to be discovered only by means of a certain mark. This quarter was the Βούκολον, as the oracle has it, the βουκόλιον, as the scholiast explains it, in either case, the herds, of Πελάγων: and this mark a certain figure on each of the sides of the cow. Now what could be the etymon of this name of Πελάγων, but πέλαγος, the sea, or the expanse of the sea? And what could be the meaning of a name derived from πέλαγος, in the form of Πελάγων, but that of the “man of the sea?” And what connection between the *man of the sea* and the *city of Thebes*, that the cow which must conduct the founder of Thebes to the site of the future city must be found among the herds of the *man of the sea*, and nowhere else? It is impossible to imagine a probable explanation of any such connection, if it is not supplied by the name and nature of the city itself, to the foundation of which all this œconomy was merely preparatory. Thebes was the city of the Deluge; and Pelagon was the Type of the Deluge. Thebes was the city of the ark; and this cow of Pelagon was the Type of the tutelary genius of the ark, under whose guidance the ark had floated in safety to its resting place amongst the waters of the Deluge, and under whose guidance Cadmus was now to be conducted to the site of the city of the Deluge.

Again, the marks of this cow, by means of which it was to be discovered among many more, were to be two in number, one on each of the sides of the cow; from which it might naturally have been expected *a priori* that they would have been something different in each instance; but instead of that, both were to be the same, and, in everything but its situation on the body of the cow, one was to be exactly the tally or counterpart of the other.

Ἐνθάδε προσπελάσας ξυλλάμβανε βοῶν ἐρίμυκον,  
τὴν ἧ κεν νότοισιν ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔχῃσι  
λευκὸν σῆμ’ ἐκάτερθε περίτροχον, ἥντε μήνης.

That is, the mark in question was to be a circle, on each of the flanks of the cow, resembling the moon; consequently, both together, these distinctive badges of the cow were to

be two full moons—one on each side of the cow. And that the oracle, in thus describing them beforehand, was anticipating nothing which was not afterwards verified by the event, may be inferred from what Pausanias tells us of the same tradition among the Boeotians even of his own time<sup>a</sup>:  
*Λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὅδε ὑπ’ αὐτῶν λόγος· ὡς ἀπιόντι ἐκ Δελφῶν Κᾶδμῳ τὴν ἐπὶ Φωκέων βοῦς γένοιτο ἡγεμῶν τῆς πορείας· τὴν δὲ βοῦν ταύτην παρὰ βουκόλων εἶναι τῶν Πελάγοντος ὠνητήν, ἐπὶ δὲ ἑκατέρας τῆς βοῦς πλευρᾶς σημεῖον (ἔτι) ἐπεῖναι λευκὸν, εἰκασμέ-  
 ρον κύκλῳ τῆς σελήνης ὅποτε εἴη πλήρης. ἔδει δὲ ἄρα Κᾶδμον καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτῷ στρατὸν ἐνταῦθα οἰκῆσαι κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν μαντείαν, εἶθθα ἢ βοῦς ἔμελλε καμοῦσα ὀκλάσειν· ἀποφαίνουσιν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον: i. e. the βομὸς of Apollo Πολιὸς, of which he speaks directly after<sup>b</sup>.*

It seems then that the characteristic mark of the cow of Cadmus, handed down by tradition, was the full moon; and yet not one full moon, but two: and that, it must be admitted, was something not to have been expected. Two full moons, at one and the same time, would have been an impossibility; and yet here we have two, in type and similitude, on the body of the same subject, and on the opposite sides of it also. Of what then could these two likenesses of the full moon have been intended? Of the two halves of one and the same moon? but in that case one of them must have been a black circle, and the other only a white one, whereas both these circles were white. And if not the *two* halves of one and the same moon, of what could they have been intended but of *two* full moons? of the full of two different moons?

Now here too only one rational and consistent explanation can be given. First, and with regard to one of these moons, it has been shewn in our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>c</sup> that the Deluge of Scripture itself began at the full of the moon; that the equable date of the Deluge having been Phaophi 17, Æra Cyc. 1658, and the Julian May 5, B. C. 2348, and the actual commencement of the Deluge being assumed Phaophi 17, May 5, at 6 A. M. mean time, for the meridian of Jerusalem, the moon was at the full, as nearly as possible, at the midnight next ensuing. And as there is no reason *a priori* why this

<sup>a</sup> ix. xii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Nonnus, iv. 316. Hyginus, Fabb. clxxviii. Europa.

<sup>c</sup> ii. 173 sqq.

particular fact should not have been perpetuated (and especially among the Egyptians) as much as that of the year and that of the day of the descent from the ark, and of the second beginning of things, (proof of which we have seen in the first Dissertation of this Part<sup>d</sup>.) it is manifest that there would be a sufficient foundation in that fact only for the tradition relating to one of the full moons of this cow—which was to be found among the herds of the man of the sea or the Deluge, and to conduct to the destined site of the city of the Deluge too.

Secondly, and with regard to the other; it has been already rendered if not absolutely certain, yet in the highest degree probable, that Cadmus came into Greece just at the epoch of the second Phœnix cycle, B. C. 1347, bringing with him both the sphere of that epoch, and the Phœnix cycle too. Now it has been shewn<sup>e</sup> that mean lunar time was incorporated in this cycle along with mean tropical and mean Julian, from the first; and that the relation of this mean lunar time of the period to the mean Julian was such, that the former receded on the latter 7 days and 18 hours of mean solar time in every cycle. That is, whatsoever was the lunar character of the Julian epoch of the cycle, at the beginning of one of its proper periods, it would be 7 days 18 hours in advance of it at the beginning of the next. And forasmuch as the lunar character of the epoch of the first cycle, April 8, B. C. 1847, *de facto* was the Luna septima, it could not fail to be the case that the lunar character of the same Julian term, at the beginning of the second cycle, April 8, B. C. 1347, would be the Luna quintadecima: and for the proof that it actually was so, we refer to our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>f</sup>.

It is evident therefore that as the full moon of the deluge, May 5 or 6, B. C. 2348, is the only matter of fact which will explain one of these marks of the cow of Cadmus; so this of the epoch of the second Phœnix cycle, April 8, B. C. 1347, is the only matter of fact which will account for the other. These two full moons, *per se*, and as equally distinctive marks of one and the same subject, the cow of Pelagon, and the cow of Cadmus, would be very inexplicable; but with this reference of one of them to the deluge, denoted by the cow

<sup>d</sup> Vol. iv. page 92.<sup>e</sup> *Fasti Cath.* iii. 499 sqq.<sup>f</sup> iii. 530.



of Pelagon, and that of the other to the sphere and the Phœnix cycle. denoted by the cow of Cadmus, and that of both to the foundation of the city of Thebes, (both the city of the ark, and the city of the sphere and the Phœnix cycle of Cadmus, at once,) they are very intelligible and significant. But this brings us to another curious question—that of the meridian of the sphere of Cadmus, as transferred from the proper quarter in Egypt to Thebes in Greece; and to the part assigned, in the popular tradition of the circumstances of the foundation of Thebes, to the Athena of Cadmus in particular.

SECTION VIII.—*On the Onka of Cadmus; and on the Athena of Cadmus.*

Δοκεῖ γὰρ Ἀθηνα συμπράξει τῷ Κάδμῳ κατὰ τῶν Σπαρτῶν. διὸ καὶ ἰδρύσατο ταύτην, Ὀγκαν προσαγορεύσας τῇ τῶν Φοινίκων διαλέκτῳ. ἐπεγέγραπτο δὲ τῷ ἱερῷ τούτῳ·

Ὀγκας νηὸς ὄδ' ἐστὶν Ἀθήνης, ὃν ποτε Κάδμος  
εἴσατο, βοῦν δ' ἱέρευσεν ὄτ' ἔκτισεν ἄστν τὸ Θήβης ε.

—Ὀγκα ἢ Ἀθηνα παρὰ Θηβαίοις ἐτιμάτο ... Ὀγκαία τοίνυν ἢ Ἀθηνα τιμάται παρὰ Θηβαίοις. Ὀγκα δὲ παρὰ Φοῖνιξιν ἢ Ἀθηνα. καὶ Ὀγκαίαι πύλαι. μέμνηται τούτων καὶ Ἀντίμαχος καὶ Ριανός. Φοῖνιξ δὲ τὸ γένος ἄνωθεν ὁ Κάδμος ἐτύγχανεν (ὦν), ὁ τῶν Θηβαίων οἰκιστής· διὸ καὶ ὡς ἐκ Φοινίκων κατηγμένος Ὀγκαν Ἀθηναῶν παρὰ Θηβαίοις τιμάσθαι ἐποίησε<sup>h</sup>—Γείτονας οὖν πύλας τὰς τῆς Ἀθηναῶν φησιν Ὀγκαίας, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ αἱ πύλαι αὐταὶ Ὀγκαίαι ἐλέγοντο. ἄνωθεν γὰρ τῶν πυλῶν ἐκέισε ἢ Ἀθηνα ἐγέγραπτο<sup>i</sup>. σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι ἐξ ἱστορίας τοιαύτης Ὀγκα ἢ Ἀθηνα παρὰ Θηβαίοις ἐλέγετο. The story follows, making Ὀγκα an Egyptian name for Athena<sup>k</sup>—Δύο ἱερά ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις ἰδρυταὶ τῇ Ἀθηναῖ, τὸ μὲν Ὀγκαίας τὸ δὲ Ἰσμηνίας κ', τ. λ<sup>l</sup>—Ὀγκα γὰρ ἢ Ἀθηνα, κατὰ Φοινίκας<sup>m</sup>—Ἀγαλμα γὰρ αὐτῆς (Παλλάδος) ὁ Κάδμος ἰδρύσατο ἐν Ὀγκαις κώμῃ τῆς Βοιωτίας. Ὀγκαία οὖν ἢ Ἀθηνα τιμάται<sup>n</sup>—Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ Ὀγκαι κώμη Θηβῶν, οὗ Κάδμος Ἀθηναῶν ἀγαλμα ἰδρύσατο<sup>o</sup>—

<sup>g</sup> Scholia in Phoenissas, 1062. Παλλάς.

<sup>h</sup> Schol. in Septem contra Thebas, 148. Μάκαιρ' ἀνασσ' Ὀγκα. cf. ad 149.

<sup>i</sup> Cf. ad 149.

<sup>k</sup> Ad vers. 471. Τέταρτος ἄλλος γείτονας πύλας ἔχων.

<sup>l</sup> Scholia in Œdip. Tyrann. ad vers. 20. Παλλάδος διπλοῖς ναοῖς.

<sup>m</sup> Steph. Byz. Ὀγκαίαι.

<sup>n</sup> Schol. in Pind. ad Olymp. ii. 48. Φιλεί δέ μιν Παλλάς.

<sup>o</sup> Tzetzes in Lycophr. 1225. Ὀγκαίου βόθρου.

Αὐτόματος δὲ  
λαϊνὸς Ὀγκαίης ἐλελίξετο βωμὸς Ἀθηνῆς,  
ὄν ποτε Κάδμος ἔδειμεν, ὅτε βραδυπειθεῖ ῥιπῆ  
μόσχου πυργόδομοιο φερέπτολις ᾤκλασε χηλῆ<sup>p</sup>.

It must be inferrible from these testimonies that there was a goddess at Thebes, supposed to have been introduced there by Cadmus, and consequently as old as the foundation; known too, as handed down traditionally, under the name of Ὀγκα or ἡ Ὀγκαία, and yet supposed to correspond even under that name at Thebes to Athena, or Pallas Athena, elsewhere. And that being the case, forasmuch as we now know that even the Athena of the rest of the Greeks came originally from Egypt, we cannot but infer from this coincidence that the Ὀγκαία of Cadmus came from Egypt too; and that, as the Hellenic Athena was only another name for the Egyptian Isis, so was this Theban Ὀγκαία also. And this conclusion is confirmed first by the fact, that the Egyptian Isis was older in Egypt itself by three years at least than the coming of Cadmus into Greece, so that he might have brought her with him to Greece; and secondly, by the fact, the evidence of which we have seen in the testimony of Pherekydes<sup>q</sup>, that according to Greek tradition Cadmus was more closely connected with the Egyptian Isis than with anything else, except the Phœnix cycle of the Egyptians. Cadmus was the brother of Isis, and the brother of Phœnix also: i. e. Cadmus and Isis, Cadmus and the Phœnix cycle, were alike associated in Greek tradition, one with the other, from the first.

Now the character and relation in which the Isis or the Neith of the Egyptians was conceived and proposed by them from the first was that of the “Mother of the Universe;” and under this particular emblem of the cow—the great Cow, the Cow κατ’ ἐξοχῆν, the Cow of the heavens, the Cow which conceived and brought forth the universe<sup>r</sup>. And this being her proper relation to every thing else, and such the symbolical mode of representing it in Egypt, her birthplace; it is almost decisive *per se* that the cow of Cadmus, the cow which shewed him the way to Thebes, which had an equal relation to the city of the Deluge and to the city of the sphere

<sup>p</sup> Nonnus, xliv. 38.

<sup>q</sup> Supra, 142.

<sup>r</sup> See our Fasti Catholici, iii. 34, 35; also Dissert. i. vol. iv. 131 sqq. supra.

and of the Phœnix cycle, must have been the Egyptian Isis, or, as she was better known to the Greeks from the time of Erechtheus downwards, the Egyptian Neith, under her most characteristic and appropriate similitude.

With respect then to this word *᾽Ογκα*, and why, and in what sense, it was applied to the Athena. in the sense of the Neith, of Cadmus; first of all, it may be inferred from a gloss in Hesychius, *᾽Ογγα*, ᾽Αθηναῖ ἐν Θήβαις ἐστὶ, χωρίου ἐπιώνυμον ἔχουσα— that *᾽Ογκα* was rather the name of a place, than of a person, at Thebes. And this distinction is confirmed by the fact that, according to some of the testimonies quoted supra, *᾽Ογκα* was the name of a village in Bœotia, connected with the worship of the Athena of Cadmus, from his time itself—and *᾽Ογγα*, according to another gloss of Hesychius on the *᾽Ογκας ᾽Αθηνας* of Æschylus<sup>s</sup>, was the name of a locality close to the Ogygian gate of Thebes: and by the fact that, according to others of the same authorities, the name of the Theban Athena was *᾽Ογκαία*, rather than *᾽Ογκα*—the latter of which might have been considered a proper name, but the former can be considered only an appellative, derived from *᾽Ογκα*.

Secondly, assuming that there was no real difference between the *᾽Ογγα* of Hesychius and the *᾽Ογκα* of our other authorities, and that *᾽Ογγα*, to judge from the more unusual occurrence of the name in that form, was originally the more genuine one of the two, we observe in the first place that *᾽Ογγα* in Greek, and *᾽Ογγα*, would be the same word differently written, but not differently pronounced; secondly, that according to the Baron Bunsen<sup>t</sup>, even *Ογγα*, in the ancient Egyptian, must have been pronounced *Ογκα*, because the ancient Egyptian alphabet was destitute of the sound G, and instead of that used K or T.

Thirdly, these observations having been premised, and the original form of this word in its own language having been determined to *᾽Ογγα*, equivalent to *᾽Ογκα*, then, with respect to the etymon and meaning of this term, *᾽Ογκα*, it is evidently resolvable into *ογ* and *κα*; and *ογ*, or *Ογ*, according to the Baron Bunsen's vocabulary of ancient Egyptian words recovered from the monuments, was the ancient Egyptian

<sup>s</sup> Septem contra Thebas, 487.

<sup>t</sup> Ancient Egypt, i. 461.

first and properly for light \*; and in the modern Coptic, according to Gesenius, it has still the sense of light. With respect to the other of its elements, *κα*, in the same vocabulary of ancient Egyptian terms<sup>v</sup> we find *kaā*, in the sense of a floor; and this compounded with *ου* would become *Ουκαα*, and in Greek *ἽΟγκα*, with the last syllable long, as it is known to have been; and the meaning of both so compounded would be that of the "Floor of On," if On was here understood to be a proper name, that of the city, so called in Egypt—or that of the "Floor of the Sun," if it was understood in the second of the senses explained above, as the name of the sun—or that of the Floor of Light, if understood simply as an appellative, and in the first and most proper of the senses in question.

The truth indeed appears to us to be that the Onka of Cadmus was the local meridian of the sphere of Cadmus. It may be collected even from the terms of the oracle, *supra*, that the city which Cadmus was to found, assisted and directed to it as he was by the cow, was to be founded on rising ground,

*ἽΟχθῶ ἔπ' ἀκροτάτῳ, κ', τ. λ.*

And this is confirmed by the testimony of the Parian Chronicle<sup>x</sup>, from which it appears that what Cadmus actually founded was the citadel of Thebes, afterwards called the *Καδμεία*, though he himself gave it the name of Thebes. His Onka therefore was situated in the *Καδμεία* *υ* †. And that the final end and effect of the œconomy of his cow, in the traditionary account of the foundation, was to designate the site of this Onka in particular, rather than that of the city

\* The transition to the sense of the sun from that of light would be easy and natural; and both these senses of the word appear in the Scriptural name of On, (Genesis xli. 50: xli. 45: xli. 20: Ezekiel xxx. 17,) which Jeremiah xliii. 13. designates by the equivalent Hebrew name of Bethshemesh, House of the Sun, and the Greeks rendered by *Ἡλιοῦπολις*, and the Arabic, according to Gesenius, still expresses by the Fountain of the Sun. See our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 448 note.

† And hence the first and oldest name of the people of Thebes, that of the *Καδμείοι*, or as Homer has it also, *Καδμειῶνες*: Il. Δ. 385. 391.

<sup>v</sup> Egypt, i. 466.

<sup>x</sup> Epocha vii.

<sup>y</sup> Cf. Pausanias, ix. xii. 3.

in general, appears from the fact which is mentioned by Pausanias<sup>z</sup>, that the Bœotians in his time still pretended to point to the spot where the cow laid itself down. If so, some spot, not too big in itself to be covered by the body of the cow. It is further confirmed by the fact which he mentions also<sup>a</sup>, that they professed to shew an altar erected on that very spot, by Cadmus himself, which had handed the same locality down to posterity. *This* spot was the ΟΝΚΑ of Cadmus; and that name having been given first of all to the site so pointed out by the cow of Cadmus, it was afterwards transferred to the goddess, denoted by the cow, who had pointed it out. According to the Bœotians too, of Pausanias' time, the altar so erected on this spot, by Cadmus himself, was dedicated to Apollo Πολιός; an epithet, which, as it stands in the text of Pausanias, with the accent on the last syllable, would denote Apollo, the hoary, or grey headed—of all epithets the least appropriate to the Apollo of the classical Olympus, and the least in character with his usual styles and titles. But if this epithet is not to be derived from a personal characteristic like that, from what can it be derivable except from πόλος, in the sense of the ecliptic circle? which, as we shewed in our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>b</sup>, was the first and proper sense of πόλος in Greek. Apollo the Πόλιος was therefore Apollo, ὁ Περιπολῶν, Apollo the traverser of the pole, in the sense of the ecliptic; Apollo the traveller of the great circle in the heavens; and the consecration or supposed consecration of an altar, by Cadmus himself\*, to Apollo, in the sense of the sun, and under this title, yet on the spot marked out as the site of his own Onka, and by the instrumentality of his tutelary goddess herself, is the strongest confirmation which could be desired of our conclusion that his Onka was nothing more or less than the local meridian of his sphere, transferred from that of On, or Heliopolis, to which it was properly adapted, to that of Thebes. The name therefore

\* Apollo indeed, and under that name, was not yet in existence in the time of Cadmus; yet that is no reason why an altar might not have been erected by the Bœotians of after-times, on the site of the Onka of Cadmus, and dedicated to Apollo Πολιός.

<sup>z</sup> Pausanias, ix. xii. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. § 2.

<sup>b</sup> i. 284 note.

might have denoted either the Floor of On, or the Floor of light, or the Floor of the sun: for it would be equally applicable to the meridian so transferred, in any of these senses.

It would thus appear that the popular tradition and belief of after-times, relating to the foundation of Thebes, rested ultimately on three different fables, the fable of the cow, the fable of the dragon, and the fable of the oracle; and to these we might add a fourth, the fable of the Dionysos of Thebes, if the subject of that in particular was not more properly the family of Cadmus, than the city of Thebes.

With respect to the relative antiquity of these fables, and to the order in which each of them came into existence, we should be entirely of opinion that the fable of the cow was invented first, and the fable of the dragon next, and the fable of the oracle last of all. As to the authors of each, we are left to conjecture only. The priests at Delphi, who must have invented for their Apollo, before he was yet in being, so many oracles, cast in the same mould and bearing internally marks of a common parentage, may well have credit for the fabrication of this, as old and as remarkable as any. The earliest notice of the fable of the cow would appear to be that in the *Τιτανογραφία*, ascribed to Musæus<sup>b</sup>; if such a person as this Musæus ever existed, or was the author of such a poem as that. But as the cow even of this Titanographia was represented to have preceded Cadmus from Delphi, the author must have known of the fable of the oracle; and therefore could not have been Musæus, who, if he actually lived in his proper order of time, was older than the Delphian oracle. The author of the fable of the dragon, as we have seen, must have been later than B. C. 798; and was very probably Eumelus, of Corinth, the first author of an *Εὐρωπεία*, or one of that class of poems into which such a fable as this was *a priori* likely to enter.

With respect to the fable of the Theban Dionysos, we have seen that its final end was simply to identify the Dionysos of Melampus with the Dionysos of Cadmus, both being supposed to have been merely the Hellenic antitype of one and the same Egyptian prototype, the Egyptian Osiris. It is ex-

<sup>b</sup> Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. iii. 1175. See supra, 146.

tremely probable that this fable in particular was early invented, and not long after the time of Melampus. It might even have been the production of Melampus himself. The name of Dionysos is recognised by Homer<sup>c</sup>, and the relation of this Dionysos to Zeus and Semele<sup>d</sup>, (if that passage is genuine,) is recognised also; which must be so far an argument that the fable of the Theban Dionysos was not altogether unknown to him. It is unnecessary to add that it is still more clearly recognised in the hymns ascribed to Homer<sup>e</sup>, and in Hesiod<sup>f</sup>; for both these were some centuries later than Homer\*.

\* The classical reader does not require to be reminded of the well known fable of the Argonautic expedition, to see the analogy between the traditional circumstances of that fable, and those of this, relating to the sphere of Cadmus, which we have just explained. This resemblance is so obvious and so striking, that no one can hesitate to conclude even from the *prima facie* agreement of the two, that if both were not imagined at once, and by the same author, one of them must have been invented in imitation of the other. The Scholia on Pindar<sup>1</sup> give us to understand, on the authority of Pherekydes too, that the teeth of the Dragon of Cadmus were divided by Mars and Athena between Cadmus and Æetes; half given to one, and half to the other: and that must be decisive of the common import of both these fables, and perhaps of their common origin, as the work of the same author, and as invented at once: 'Ὁ γὰρ Φερεκίδης διττά φησιν εἶναι Σπαρτῶν γένη. τὸν γὰρ Ἄρη καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνῶν τοὺς μὲν ἡμίσεις τῶν ὀδόντων Κάδμου δοῦναι, τοὺς δὲ ἡμίσεις Αἰήτη.

The Dragon of Æetes and Colchis, it is self-evident, in the nature of things, could not have been a different thing from the Dragon of Cadmus and Thebes; and both being understood of some Type of the sphere alike, then the tradition just referred to from Pherekydes, is decisive that the sphere denoted by the Dragon of Æetes must have been absolutely the same with that denoted by the Dragon of Cadmus. Each of them was a sphere of the same number of teeth, i. e. of degrees; and the sphere of Cadmus, as we have seen, having been a sphere of thirteen teeth, so must the sphere of Æetes also have been. It confirms this conclusion, that as the Dragon of Cadmus was sacred to Mars, so was the Dragon of Æetes; and both being types of the sphere of Mazzaroth, the principal Decan of both was the planet Mars, and the Mazzaroth epoch of each, March 24, was the proper Julian date of the first of the planetary houses in the principal sign of the sphere of Mazzaroth, the Krion of Mazzaroth, sacred also

<sup>1</sup> Isthmia, vi. 13.

<sup>c</sup> Iliad, Z. 132. 135. Od. Ω. 74.

<sup>e</sup> Hymn στ' 1-59. cf. κε'.

<sup>d</sup> Iliad, Ξ. 323. 325.

<sup>f</sup> Theogonia, 940-942. Aspis, 400.

to the planet Mars. It is manifest therefore that the author of this Fable too must have been as well acquainted with the doctrine of the Planetary Houses, and of the Decania of the Sphere, as the author of that of the Dragon of Cadmus; and in either case later than B. C. 798; as we have seen that Eumelus of Corinth, the probable author of the Fable of Cadmus, actually was.

In like manner, the Golden Fleece of this celebrated fable, stript of this one individuating circumstance of its being a fleece of gold, in other respects being neither more nor less than the fleece of a ram—this ram of the fable is simply the first of the signs of the sphere, the Krion of the sphere of Mazzaroth. And this fleece too, according to the fable, was sacred to Mars, and under the tutela of the Dragon of Mars, because the Krion of Mazzaroth was sacred to Mars also. It is manifest too, that, as one of the signs of the sphere, and as the first and principal one, (that from which all the rest took their rise, and on which they all depended,) it may have been, and probably was intended in the fable, as the representative of the sphere in general; so that the end and effect assigned by the fable of the Argonautic expedition in general, which was the obtaining possession and bringing away of this fleece, on this principle, could have been nothing more or less than the fact of the discovery, some time or other, in this quarter, and the bringing away from thence to Greece, by these adventurers in the Argo, of the Sphere of Mazzaroth; which, for any thing known to the contrary, may have been a simple historical fact.

It is clear that, in the opinion of Herodotus<sup>2</sup>, (our oldest authority for the fact,) as well as of others of the ancient Greeks later than Herodotus, the people of Colchis, at the eastern extremity of the Pontus Euxinus, were a colony from Egypt, which some time or other settled in that quarter. Now there was no reason *a priori*, in the nature of things, or under the circumstances of the case, that when a colony of Egyptians migrated to Bœotia, in B. C. 1347, a colony of Egyptians might not have migrated in a different direction, and ultimately found their way to the site of the ancient Colchis. And if Cadmus and the colony with him could bring the sphere of their own epoch, the sphere of the first revision, B. C. 1347, to Bœotia, so might the leader of this colony have brought it to Colchis. And there might it have been discovered, for ought which we know to the contrary, by the first of the Greeks, who found their way to the same locality in the course of maritime adventure, about an hundred years afterwards. These two facts, we say, would be nothing incredible; one that when so many colonies were leaving Egypt, in or about B. C. 1347, one might have ventured up the Hellespont and down the Pontus Euxinus, and settled at Colchis, carrying with it the second edition of the sphere, the Mazzaroth sphere of the time being—the knowledge of which must have been the common endowment of every educated Egyptian of the time—the other, that a body of adventurers from Thessaly, who were the first

<sup>2</sup> ii. 104: cf. Apollonius Rhod. iv. 271–278; and the Scholia in loc.: Diod. Sic. i. 28.



of the Greeks to attempt the navigation of the Hellespont and the Pontus Euxinus also, should have found it at Colchis, and brought either the sphere itself or the knowledge of it back with them to Thessaly. The fable of the Argonautic expedition, stripped of every thing purely marvellous and adscititious, might evidently have rested on a simple historical basis like this; in which it would be difficult to say what there could be either impossible *per se*, or improbable *a priori*.

It is very observable that Homer appears to have known nothing of these adscititious and incredible circumstances, the Dragon, the teeth, the fleece, and the like; and yet he was aware of the fact of a voyage as far as the land of Æetes, and in the Argo, and under Jason, which would so far be a description of the voyage of the Argonauts; and what is more, he was a believer in it too, as an historical matter of fact.

Οἷη δὴ κείνη γε παρέπλω ποντοπόρος νῆυς  
 Ἄργῳ πασιμέλουσα, παρ' Αἰήταο πλέουσα  
 καὶ νύ κε τὴν ἔνθ' ὄκα βάλεν μεγάλας ποτὶ πέτρας,  
 ἀλλ' Ἕρην παρέπεμψεν, ἐπεὶ φίλος ἦεν Ἰήσων<sup>3</sup>.

And he recognises Æetes along with Kirke<sup>4</sup>; and by the mention of Evenus as the son of Jason and Hypsipyle<sup>5</sup>, and contemporary with the heroes of Troy, and reigning at Lemnos all through the Trojan war, he recognises another circumstance of the voyage of the Argonauts, which, for ought that is known to the contrary, may have been historically true of it, their visit to Lemnos, on the way to the Hellespont and the Pontus Euxinus: and he implies too that the time of the voyage itself, as a matter of fact, could not have been more than the ordinary length of the life of one person, before the last year of the siege of Troy.

Assuming then that for the voyage of Jason, and in this direction, there was a foundation in the matter of fact, fifty or sixty years before the war of Troy; we should be entirely of opinion that the simple traditionary account of the voyage had suffered little or no changes from the embellishments of fable, between that time and the time of Homer, three or four hundred years later, except in the name of the quarter, where this discovery of the sphere was made, the land of Αἶα, instead of that of Colchis, and in that of the supposed owner of the sphere, before it came into the possession, or to the knowledge, of the Greeks, the king of this land of Αἶα, Αἰήτης. For this word Αἰήτης is evidently not a proper name, but a *nomen gentile*. It is derivable from Αἶα by the same analogy as Ἰήτης from Ἴος: and as Ἰήτης denoted a native of Ἴος, so must Αἰήτης have denoted a native of Αἶα. The Αἰήτης of this fable is simply The man of Αἶα; and if we knew what was always intended by this Αἶα of the fable, we should know what must always have been intended by the man of this Αἶα—the Αἰήτης of the fable, the type and impersonation of this Αἶα itself.

<sup>3</sup> Odys. M. 69.

<sup>4</sup> Od. K. 135-139: M. 1-3.

<sup>5</sup> Iliad. H. 468-471: Ψ. 746: cf.

Φ. 41. It must however be observed, and it will, we trust, be made to ap-

pear on a future opportunity, that the Αἶα of Homer was a very different locality from that of the Αἶα of the Argonautic expedition of fable.

Now there is great analogy at first sight between the *aîa* of the poets and the *γαîa* of common Greek: so much so that the latter might have been only the former with the Æolic digamma prefixed. And without going into the question, whether *γαîa* was derived from *aîa*, or *aîa* from *γαîa*, we may observe that from the analogy of the adverbs *ἀεὶ* and *αἰεὶ*, and the substantives *αἰὼν* and *αἶος* in Greek also, the idea which must have entered the word in either shape, it is to be presumed, must have been that of something which always had been, and always would be, the same—something which always had existed, and always would exist—the same in itself, and relatively to everything else. And as nothing could answer to the description of that which always had existed and always would exist in the same way, so well as the material universe, made up of the two great parts, the heavens and the earth, the one the *ἀντίστοιχον* of the other, we think it exceedingly probable that in the intention of the first authors of these different terms of *γαîa* and *aîa*, while *γαîa* was restricted to the earth, as one great half of the material and visible universe, *aîa* was intended of the heavens, as the other, and in its proper relation to the earth of *ἀντίχθων* or *ἀντίγαυα*.

And as, of the heavens themselves, the most remarkable part was the ecliptic or zodiac, the part defined, and distinguished from the rest of the heavens, as the annual pathway of the sun, the moon, and the planets; it is very conceivable that, on this principle, the name and idea of *Αἰήτης*, or the lord of *Αἶα*, might be nothing more or less than the idea and name of the ecliptic or zodiac personified; or at least of the sun, as the presiding and governing principle of the ecliptic—as the lord or regent of this land of *Αἶα κατ' ἐξοχήν* \*. And that the *Αἰήτης* of the Argonautic fable was always closely connected with the sun—appears from its own suppositions; one of which is that the *Αἰήτης* of Colchis himself was the son of the sun.

\* Though no sister of *Αἰήτης* has any part assigned her in the popular fable of the Argonauts, yet, as the two most conspicuous objects in the heavens, and the most closely connected with the ecliptic, were the sun and the moon; it was to be expected *a priori* that if the sun, as the presiding and ruling principle of the land of *αἶα*, in the sense of the ecliptic, was personified under this name of *Αἰήτης*—the moon would be associated with him under some proper name or other, in the same relation. Now that this association must have been very early made appears from the testimony of Homer; who was aware of the impersonation and name of *Κίρκη*, as the sister of *Αἰήτης*, *Od. K. 135: M. 2. 3.* Now what is this name of *Κίρκη*, but the feminine form of *Κίρκος*? and, what difference is there between *Κίρκος*, (the Latin *circus*,) and *Κρίκος*, the ordinary Greek term for a ring or a circle? And what could be a more appropriate reflection of the sun than the moon at the full? and what name could be more proper for the moon at the full, in Greek, than *Κρίκη* or *Κίρκη*—taken from the idea of a perfect round, or circle. With reason therefore might the *Αἰήτης* of the fable, or the man of *Αἶα*, as the type of the sun, have a sister called *Κίρκη*, the type of the moon at the full. But the observable circumstance is, that, as the sun and the full moon can never occupy the same part of the ecliptic at once, but if the sun is supposed to be in the east, the full moon at the same moment must be in the west, and

In the simple historical fact of an early voyage from Thessaly to the Pontus Euxinus, made by Greeks and under a leader called Jason, to which all antiquity bears witness, for our part, we can see nothing incredible, nothing improbable. The date too of this early voyage, to judge from the testimony of Homer, and from the genealogies of many of the worthies of Troy, must have been not more than fifty or sixty years before the capture of Troy, i. e. about B. C. 1230 or 1240. Nor do we know of any reason why the ship in which this voyage was made might not have been the first ever built, or ever used for such a purpose, in Thessaly; nor why it might not have been called Ἀργῶ, as all antiquity seems to be agreed that it was. Nor do we see any reason why we should not suppose this ship to have been both built and called by its peculiar name, while the recollection of the ark of Scripture, (the first ship which was ever built among men anywhere,) was still preserved among the Greeks. For this ship too, as well as the ark, is represented to have been built under the Divine direction and with the Divine assistance; and this ship, like the ark, was supposed to sail where it would, without any pilot to guide it, and this ship, like the ark, to pass safely where all other ships would have been liable to perish; and lastly, this ship, like the ark, (which was still in existence in these times, a thousand years after the flood,) never grew old. And with respect to its name of Ἀργῶ, there would be little difference between Ἀργῶ and Ἀρκῶ; and what would Ἀρκῶ have denoted in Greek but the principle of protection, defence, security, personified? like Καλυψῶ, the principle of concealment, and a multitude of similar terms, a list of which we collected elsewhere<sup>6</sup>. Hesychius has ἄρκος, in the sense of βοήθεια, ἄρκεσμα; and the Latin has arx, derived from ἄρκος, in the sense of a stronghold or citadel. Nor is it more extraordinary that Jason should have given his ship the name of Ἀργῶ, in the sense of Ἀρκῶ, in memory of the ark, than that Danaus should have given his city, which he founded in the Peloponnese, and very probably for the same reason, the name of Ἀργος, instead of Ἀρκος.

The oldest sphere which appears to have been known or heard of among the Greeks was attributed to Chiron the Centaur<sup>7</sup>. Now Chiron too was a native of Thessaly, and a contemporary of the Argonauts, and according to some, an Argonaut himself. It is obvious that the most natural and consistent explanation of this sphere of Chiron's, is to suppose it was that which the Argonauts brought back from Colchis. The ancients too attributed the invention of the solid sphere to Thales<sup>8</sup>; but it is much more probable that Thales himself derived it from Egypt, and that the Egyptians had it among them from the epoch of the first Phœnix cycle, B. C.

*vice versa*, so the local residence of the Αἰθήρης of Homer is supposed to have been the land of Αἴα, and the local residence of his Κίρκη is supposed to have been the νῆσος Αἰαίη too (K. 135, M. 2. 3): but, as we shall probably see hereafter, one on the east, the other on the west, or *vice versa*, of the same island in general.

<sup>6</sup> Supra, Dissertation iii. vol. iv. 599 n.

<sup>7</sup> Fasti Catholici, iii. 384.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. iv. 134.

1847, or at least from that of the second, B. C. 1347, when the zodiac properly so called, in contradistinction to the ecliptic, may be said to have been invented<sup>9</sup>. And if the solid sphere of this epoch was brought into Greece by Cadmus, nothing would be better calculated to explain the name and meaning of his *Ὀγκά*, as the place where he set it up, than that fact; and if the colony of Colchis took it with them at the same time to that quarter, nothing would be better calculated than that fact too, to explain the story of the Golden Fleece, brought back by the Argonauts, if understood of this sphere, as brought back too: but how obtained, and whether with or without the consent of its original owners, would be another question.

And here the part assigned in the fable to Medea would have to be taken into account—with respect to which we see no reason why it may not be literally accepted, agreeably to the belief and testimony of the ancients, so far at least as to suppose that Jason brought back such a person with him from Colchis, (and very possibly contrary to the will of her own parents,) who had been principally instrumental in his getting possession of the sphere, or in the language of the fable, the Golden Fleece: and without whom,

Οὐδέκοτ' ἄν μέγα κῶας ἀνήγαγεν αὐτὸς Ἰήσων  
ἐξ Αἴης, τελέσας ἀλγυρόεσσαν ὁδόν<sup>10</sup>—

even though it may be implied in that supposition that he must have stolen it away from its owners.

The fabulous circumstances connected with the story, the Golden Fleece, literally understood, the dragon—the dragon's teeth, the bulls\* of fire, and the like—must all be set down to the invention of the later poets, and probably to that of the author of the cognate fable of the Dragon of Cadmus—which we have supposed to have been Eumelus of Corinth. The two fables are so much akin that they cannot be considered the offspring of distinct minds. This fable, as we have already observed, argues an acquaintance with the astrological doctrine of the planetary houses and of the Decania of the sphere, as much as the other; a knowledge which in both alike would suit to the time of Eumelus, B. C. 787, eleven years at least after that doctrine was broached in Egypt. It is manifest too that the author of this fable must have known the signs of the ecliptic by their proper zodiacal names; the first by the name of Aries, the second by that of the Bull: for the Golden Fleece itself was nothing but the first

\* These bulls seem to have been imagined by the inventor of the fable, as the Types of the sphere of Mazzaroth in its first and proper state, when the sign of the bull was the first in the sphere, and stood in the same relation to the rest of the signs, as the sign of Aries in the sphere of B. C. 1347. The Ram was the Type of the sphere of 1347; the Bull, of the sphere of the beginning: and the former being lineally derivable from the latter, the bull, in the fable of the Argonautic expedition, was as much concerned in the tutela and defence of the Golden Fleece of that fable, as the dragon.

<sup>9</sup> *Fasti Cath.* iii. 361 sqq.

<sup>10</sup> *Mimnermus*, x. 1.

sign of the sphere, the Krion of Mazzaroth, and his bulls breathing fire and smoke, nothing but the second, the Tauron of Mazzaroth. And though the signs received zodiacal names first B. C. 1347<sup>11</sup>, they were delineated under the corresponding zodiacal figures only B. C. 848<sup>12</sup>.

Mr. Grote observes in his *History of Greece*<sup>13</sup>, that the fragments of this Eumelus<sup>14</sup> are the first which mentioned Æetes and Colchis in conjunction with what Mr. Grote calls the mythological genealogies of his own city of Corinth: and it is certain that whether originally or not, yet ultimately and in the event, there was a close connection between the fable of the Golden Fleece and Corinth—that while the traditionary story of the expedition began in Thessaly it ended at Corinth—that Jason and Medea acted the last part, assigned them in the traditionary history of both, respectively at Corinth—and that the Argo itself was laid up at Corinth<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 361.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 431.

<sup>13</sup> i. 311 note.

<sup>14</sup> *Εὐρωπέα* *Fragm.* 7. *Κορινθιακὰ* *Fragm.* 2-5.

<sup>15</sup> *Dio Chrys. Oratio xxxvii.* 107. 26=458.

## DISSERTATION VII.

*On the Rhodian Corrections of the Primitive Calendar ;  
and on the Rhodian "Αλεια and Τληπολέμεια.*

---

### CHAPTER I.

*On the Octaëteric and the Metonic Correction of the island of  
Rhodes.*

---

#### SECTION I.—*On the proper Type of the Rhodian Octaëteris.*

There is every reason to believe that the first lunar correction, made in the island of Rhodes, was one of the third type of the Hellenic Octaëteris in general ; that its original date was January 7, B. C. 542 ; that, at the end of its first period of 160 years, B. C. 382, its epoch was raised from January 7 to January 8 ; that the Metonic correction was adopted at the same time, and the head of the calendar shifted from the first month, Jan. 8, to the fifth, May 6. We hope to offer various confirmations of these different propositions, in the course of the ensuing Dissertation : but the strongest and most conclusive proof of the kind is reserved for a distinct chapter, in which we propose to treat of the chronology of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, and of the inferences deducible therefrom, of the nature and constitution of the Rhodian calendar, in the time of the author.

#### SECTION II.—*On the recovery of the names and order of the months in the Rhodian Calendar, from the Inscriptiones Figulinæ or Figlinæ of antiquity.*

Though our acquaintance with any of the calendars of antiquity, in which the names and order of the months were unknown, could not be said to be complete, yet strictly

speaking that knowledge would not be indispensable to a general idea of one of these calendars. Nothing would be absolutely necessary, except a knowledge of the Julian epoch of the calendar, and of the nature of its proper cycle. The abstract or Julian type of the calendar would thus be known; and it would always be in our power, from these data only, to assign the proper Julian epoch of any of its months, and of any day of that month.

In the case however which we are about to consider, (that of the lunar corrections of the primitive solar calendar, peculiar to the island of Rhodes,) it happens that the names of all the months have been brought to light by a particular kind of evidence, the nature of which we shall proceed to explain.

In the *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, there is a numerous class of inscriptions which have been discovered on the remains of the potter's art, the *opera figulina*, or *figlina*, of classical antiquity, and principally of that kind of its productions which are called *Diotæ*, i. e. jars, or urns, with two handles, the inscriptions in question being found on these handles. Many such relics have been met with in Sicily<sup>c</sup>, some at Syracuse, or in its vicinity<sup>d</sup>, some at Acraë<sup>e</sup>, some at Leocata, or Alicata, on the site of the ancient Phintias, or near that of the ancient Gela<sup>f</sup>, some at Eryx<sup>g</sup>, some at Panormus<sup>h</sup>, some at Thermæ Himeræorum<sup>i</sup>, some at Messana<sup>k</sup>, others at Tauromenium<sup>l</sup>, others at Catania<sup>m</sup>, others at Leontium<sup>n</sup>. In short, so numerous in the ancient Sicily did they appear to have been, that the learned could scarcely have failed to infer from such evidence as this, that the remains which were found in such abundance in Sicily must have been manufactured on the spot; and consequently that the names of the months, which were discoverable upon them also, must have been those of the ancient Sicilian calendar<sup>o</sup>.

But since these discoveries were made in Sicily, a still greater number of the same kind of remains has been found

<sup>c</sup> Corp. Inscript. iii. 568-673. No. 5375-5748 e.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. No. 5375-5392 d.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. No. 5439-5453.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. No. 5477-5488. cf. 5751.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. No. 5502-5541.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. No. 5556-5560. cf. 5577.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 5591 b.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. 5619 c-5619 l.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. 5645.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. 5653-5675 c.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. 5748 b-5748 d.

<sup>o</sup> See Corp. Inscript. iii. 674-678.

in quarters very remote from Sicily—at Athens, at Alexandria, and even in the ancient Sarmatia—but more particularly at Alexandria <sup>p</sup>: of which too, a circumstantial and interesting account has been given by the author of their discovery himself, J. L. Stoddart, Esq., in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature <sup>q</sup>, as read before the Society in 1847. The researches of this diligent inquirer succeeded in disinterring 406 specimens of these inscriptions on Diotæ, or two handled jars, in Alexandria only; 200 of which and upwards exhibited the same names of the months, and the same names of the magistrates, as those which had before been met with in Sicily, so as to leave no doubt that all must have had a common origin, and must have come from the same quarter.

We are told by Pliny that manufactures of this description, (the opera figlina of former times,) were articles of trade, carried from the places where they were made to other quarters for sale, and that particular firms stamped their own marks on the particular productions of their own shops <sup>r</sup>; Hæc quoque per maria terrasque ultro citroque portantur, insignibus rotæ officinis. The island of Cnidus was noted for its earthenwares <sup>s</sup>; and 177 of these remains have been found with the impress of Κνιδίων, and the names of the persons in office at the time, but not the names of any months. Attica also was celebrated for the same kind of productions, particularly the parts about Marathon <sup>v</sup>; and Pliny <sup>x</sup> mentions Rhegium and Cumæ, in Italy, and the island of Cos, in the Ægean, as similarly distinguished. And this island was so near to Rhodes, that the physical peculiarities of the latter, it might always have been supposed *a priori*, must have adapted it for excelling in the same productions as the neighbouring island of Cos. And though it cannot be denied that there is no testimony, extant at present, which has handed down the name of Rhodes, as a well known seat of the manufactory of potter's ware, that desideratum is amply supplied by the copious remains of the art of the potter, which have

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. tom. iii. Præf. pag. ii sqq.

<sup>q</sup> Series ii. vol. iii. p. 1-127.

<sup>r</sup> H. N. xxxv. 46.

<sup>s</sup> Athenæus, i. 50.

<sup>t</sup> Corp. Inscript. tom. iii. Præf. xiv-xvii.

<sup>v</sup> Athenæus, i. 50.

<sup>x</sup> H. N. xxxv. 46.



been discovered both in Sicily and at Alexandria, with too much upon them, common to all of them, to allow us to suppose they could have come from different quarters, and with too much peculiar to, and characteristic of, the ancient Rhodes, to allow us to suppose they could have come from any quarter but that.

In the first place, though these vessels were the work of private shops or companies, yet they would not be exposed for sale, either at home or abroad, without some public sanction or other; and this it appears was given by stamping them with the name of the magistrate in office: the use of this stamp, in all probability, being to serve as a warrant to the buyers that, in point of gauge or capacity, these vessels came up to the prescribed standard.

In the next place, though it is known that the name of the principal civil magistrate at Rhodes was that of *Πρύτανις*, it does not follow that the *Πρύτανις* was the *ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος* at Rhodes. Cases are not wanting, in which while the principal magistrate was a civil officer, the person who sealed the Fasti was an ecclesiastical dignitary; for example, at Syracuse, where the *Στρατηγὸς*, or Prætor, was the principal civil officer, but the *Ἀμφίπολος*, or Priest of Jupiter, was the Eponyme<sup>z</sup>. Now the island of Rhodes, from the moment when it was supposed to have actually come into existence, was supposed also to have been sacred to the sun. The sun was the tutelary genius of Rhodes. The *Ilaleia*, or feast of the sun, was the principal, and the oldest, festival in its liturgic year. The celebrated colossus was an image of the sun. It would be nothing extraordinary therefore, if at Rhodes, not the *prytanis*, but the priest of the sun, signed and sealed the Fasti every year; just as the priestesses of Hera did at Argos, and the priests of Posidon at Halicarnassus<sup>a</sup>. It is consequently only consistent with what was *a priori* to be expected that, if these Diotæ came from Rhodes, the official style and title, discoverable upon them, should be found to be that of the priests of the sun. Sixteen of them have the

<sup>z</sup> See Part i. vol. ii. 421.

<sup>a</sup> See Part i. vol. iii. 370 and *n*.

inscription Ἐπ' or Ἐφ' ἱερέως, followed by a proper name; two of them found in Sicily<sup>b</sup>, the rest at Alexandria<sup>c</sup>. In the remaining instances, the proper name of the dignitary is mentioned, but not the style of his office; though from analogy it may reasonably be concluded it must have been that of the ἱερεὺς in these as well as in the rest.

But thirdly, besides the proper style of the Eponyme, certain devices appear on these Diotæ, which were characteristic of the ancient Rhodes. For example, on many of them an head surrounded with rays, a *caput radiatum*; which, it is self-evident, must have been intended for that of the sun; and the same insigne is found on the coins of Rhodes<sup>d</sup>. On many of these fragments, this device appears along with the proper name of the person, but without that of any of the months; and in seven instances at least (all from Alexandria) it is accompanied not only by the name of the person in office, but also by that of one or other of the following months, Thesmophorius, Dalus, Sminthius, Artamitius, Hyakinthius, and Panamus<sup>e</sup>.

Again, on some of these relics a remarkable emblem is discoverable, in the shape of a certain flower; concerning the nature of which there may possibly be some difference of opinion, but concerning its relation to the island of Rhodes, in these instances, there can be none, insomuch as this also is found on the coins of Rhodes<sup>f</sup>. As to the flower itself, at first sight it might be taken for a rose; and Mr. Stoddart has given it the name of "the Conventional Rose;" and has compared it to the rose of heraldic shields or scutcheons. But in reality it appears to have been the Βαλαύστιον of antiquity; the flower of the wild pomegranate: concerning which, and its peculiar mystical significancy, and its relation to the island of Rhodes in this mystical sense, we hope to speak by and by. This characteristic Rhodian emblem occurs 27 times, on Diotæ found indiscriminately at Alexandria, at Athens, and in Si-

<sup>b</sup> No. 365 : 448.

<sup>c</sup> No. 56 : 66 : 67 : 133 : 141 : 150 : 169 : 189 : 312 : 378 : 413 : 417 : 421 : 422 : cf. Corp. Inscript. iii. Præf. Tab. i. v-xiii.

<sup>d</sup> Eckhel, Doctr. Numm. ii. 602.

Insulæ Cariæ.

<sup>e</sup> Corp. Inscript. iii. Præfatio, vi. No. 76 : 274 : 341 : 359 : 417 : 422 : 458.

<sup>f</sup> Eckhel, ii. 602. Insulæ Cariæ.

cilyf, with the names also of the months Thesmophorius, Dalius, Sminthius, Panamus, Hyakinthius, Artamitius, Diosthyus, Agrianius; all but Diosthyus twice at least, and with some of them five or six times over.

For these reasons we may safely conclude that these Diotæ, with their proper inscriptions and devices, must have come from the island of Rhodes; and therefore that the names of the months, which appear upon them, must have been those of the Rhodian calendar, i. e. of the quarter where they were made, and from which they were exported; not of any of the quarters where they are discoverable at present. And the names which actually occur upon them, arranged in the order in which they appear to have stood both in the first type of the calendar, B. C. 542, and in the second, B. C. 382, will be as follows.

SECTION III.—*Order and names of the months in the Rhodian Calendar, both the Octaëteric, Jan. 7, B. C. 542, and the Metonic, May 6, B. C. 382.*

Month.	Name.	Type i. B.C. 542.	Month.	Type ii. B.C. 382.
i	Ἀγρίανιος	Jan. 7	ix	Jan. 8
ii	Βαδρόμιος	Feb. 5	x	Feb. 6
iii	Θευδαίσιος	March 7	xi	March 8
iv	Δάλιος	April 5	xii	April 6
v	Ἀρταμίτιος	May 5	i	May 6
vi	Πάναμος A	June 3	ii	June 4
vi	Πάναμος B	—		
vii	Πεδαγείτννος	July 3	iii	July 4
viii	Ῥακίνθιος	Aug. 1	iv	Aug. 2
ix	Καρνεῖος	— 31	v	Sept. 1
x	Θεσμοφόριος	Sept. 29	vi	— 30
xi	Σμίνθιος	Oct. 29	vii	Oct. 30
xii	Διόσθιος	Nov. 27	viii	Nov. 28

The number of these months is neither more nor less than that which must have entered a lunar calendar every year, viz. twelve; and as, besides these, such a calendar must also have required, at stated times, an extraordinary month, so it

† No. 41: 54: 56: 67: 71: 72: 75: 288: 335: 336: 361: 383: 442. cf. 97: 114: 132: 142: 146: 150: 165: 489 also.

166: 176: 179: 184: 186: 230: 250:

is very observable that such a month too appears in this list, recovered from the same sources as any of the rest, the sixth month repeated, the Πάναμος B or δεύτερος of the list<sup>f</sup>, which in this calendar must have been the intercalary month.

With regard to the actual order of these months, though no one, in the absence of express testimony to that point, in any of these instances, could safely venture a confident opinion; we have seen reason to conclude notwithstanding, that the above arrangement, on the whole, may be considered the true, not merely while the calendar was still attached to January 7, but when its head had been shifted to May 6. That change in particular would make no difference to the order of the months *inter se*. Particular proofs of this conclusion in particular instances may possibly appear when we come to consider each in its turn: and something like a general argument of its truth, as applicable to all in common, may perhaps be derived from the same kind of evidence, which has made us acquainted with all.

For if these Diotæ were manufactured at Rhodes, and yet are found in modern times at Athens, at Olbia, at Alexandria, or in some one or other of the cities of Sicily, it is manifest they must have been exported from Rhodes to those quarters. Now when we consider the rule of antiquity with respect to the opening and shutting of the sea; it will not be thought improbable that the manufacture of such wares, intended for exportation, would go on more actively in the spring and summer half of the year than in the opposite one. To judge from the extant remains of such productions which have been discovered, the state of the case *de facto* is this; that 59<sup>a</sup> of them were made and stamped in Agrianus; 51<sup>b</sup> in Dalus; 46<sup>c</sup>

<sup>f</sup> Præf. p. v. sqq. No. 9: 151: 136: 144: 147: 149: 153: 165: 166: 207: 279: 306: 340.

<sup>a</sup> No. 2: 23: 24: 43: 50: 57: 61: 285: 286: 294: 302: 312: 314: 321: (62): 68: 83: 90: 100: 101: 105: 338: 349: 360: 363: 368: 378: 379: 106: 127: 138: 140: 158: 162: 167: 391: 399: 421: 441: 455: 456: 462: 168: 194: 214: 219: 229: 232: 233: 474.

<sup>c</sup> No. 3: 4: 19: 48: 51: (62): 66: 241: 248: 268: 269: 288: 290: 292: 69: 87: 93: 107: 112: 128: 129: 304: 316: 317: 318: 334: 335: 347: 139: 141: 156: 157: 163: 183: 197: 357: 365: 390: 395: 396: 397: 404: 215: 224: 230: 236: 249: 284: 293: 407: 427: 432: 433: 434: 435: 436: 300: 301: 319: 328: 336: 355: 359: 448: 454: 460: 469.

<sup>b</sup> No. 13: 20: 25: 39: 54: 55: 58: 366: 367: 377: 398: 412: 437: 438: 63: 67: 88: 95: 108: 109: 114: 116: 440: 449: 453: 458: 459.

in Artamitius; 55<sup>d</sup> in Panamus; besides 6<sup>c</sup> in Panamus secundus; 39<sup>f</sup> in Hyakinthius; 14<sup>g</sup> in Carneus; 21<sup>h</sup> in Thesmophorius; 20<sup>i</sup> in Sminthius; 3<sup>k</sup> in Diosthyus. It follows that four times as many are still extant, which must have been manufactured in the first eight months of the above list, from Agrianius to Hyakinthius, as in the last four, from Carneus to Diosthyus; and this we think is a good argument that those eight months of our list must have taken in the spring and summer quarters of the year, and these four must have coincided with the autumnal or winter quarter; during the former of which the sea would be open, and during the latter it would be shut.

It is observable also that, to judge from the relative number and proportion of the remains still extant of these manufactures, the months most productive of them must have been Agrianius, Dalius, Artamitius, Panamus, and Hyakinthius. Now the first of these in Type i. of the calendar was the first month of the year, and the third was so in Type ii. In each of these months, as the first in its proper type, fresh magistrates would come into office, and the style of the year would be changed: and it was naturally to be expected that such wares as these, intended for exportation, yet stamped with the name of the presiding officary for the time being, would be made in the greatest number in the first month of the official year, that they might have the benefit of the latest official name. The month Dalius too, as the fourth in the old calendar, and the month next to the vernal equinox both in the old and in the new, was very likely to be one in which the manufacture of wares of this kind for exportation would go on actively. For the same reason, very few might be expected to be executed in the last month of the year,

<sup>d</sup> No. 10: 21: 35: 42: 49: 71: 72:	362: 403: 408: 414: 417: 442: 443:
96: 131: 154: 160: 170: 171: 176:	451: 478: 488.
182: 185: 186: 187: 188: 189: 209:	<sup>g</sup> No. 11: 77: 86: 130: 145: 152:
217: 226: 231: 235: 239: 240: 243:	164: 216: 382: 384: 400: 413: 472:
251: 271: 276: 277: 280: 295: 303:	476.
323: 324: 325: 330: 333: 344: 350:	<sup>h</sup> No. 14: 26: 41: 59: 65: 75: 76:
370: 371: 372: 383: 385: 392: 401:	117: 159: 234: 238: 322: 329: 358:
409: 422: 423: 450: 470: 482.	361: 369: 439: 479: 480: 481: 485.
<sup>e</sup> No. 9: 151: 207: 279: 306: 340.	<sup>i</sup> No. 56: 110: 118: 133: 137: 146:
<sup>f</sup> No. 1: 5: 17: 33: 53: 73: 78: 85:	169: 220: 252: 253: 296: 313: 341:
97: 98: 111: 119: 132: 142: 148:	380: 387: 402: 405: 477: 486: 487.
150: 174: 175: 179: 196: 218: 242:	<sup>k</sup> No. 250: 310: 339.
272: 273: 274: 287: 307: 327: 342:	

when the style was already out of date; and it is a curious coincidence that, though so many have been found which must have been made in Agrianus, only three have yet been discovered which were made in Diosthyus. As to the months Panamus and Hyakinthius; if they coincided with June and August, as they do in our list, the former was the middle month of the year, when the manufacture of such wares as these, intended for the foreign market, might be going on with as much activity as in the first; besides being a month very favourable for navigation. Hyakinthius too, which coincided with August, though not favourable for voyages from Rhodes to the north, because of the Etesian winds, (which must have blown all through that month,) would be favourable for voyages southward; and in other respects be a fine month for navigation in general. Pedageitnius, on the other hand, as coinciding with July, was a dangerous month; because of the storms which usually occurred at the beginning of it; and very probably little business would be done in that month\*.

SECTION IV.—*On the Etymons and meaning of the names of the months in the Rhodian Calendar.*

We shall now proceed to consider these names in detail, in order to discover, if possible, how far the probable explana-

\* If there is any exception to the above rule, it would seem to be in the case of the two months, Badromius and Theudaisius. The number of Diotæ extant at present, referrible to the former, is 18, and referrible to the latter, is only two. We may certainly infer from this latter fact, that probably very few were made in that month; but then the reason of that may have been that probably more were exported in that month than in any other, and that the month itself was more devoted to the exportation than to the manufacture of such wares as these. The reason of which too may have been that this month, as our list shews, was that in which the sea was first and properly opened again after the winter; the vernal equinox itself always falling in this month.

Badromius again, though liable in some years of the cycle to fall back into the winter, was nevertheless generally speaking the first of the months of the spring—the month of the Ζεφύρου πνοή—the month of the early spring, ἀρχομένου ἔαρος as such: and that too being a time of the year when navigation was wont to be renewed after the winter, especially for short voyages, and along the coast, it is not surprising that symptoms of maritime and commercial activity should be perceptible also in this month.

tion of each is calculated to confirm the order in the calendar, and the place in the natural and the Julian year, assigned them in our list.

Type i. i. = Type ii. ix. Ἀγριάνιος = Γαμηλιών.

This name of Ἀγριάνιος, so far as we have yet discovered, was either peculiar to the Rhodian calendar, or common only to the calendar of Cos besides; in which also, as we learnt from Soranus' Life of Hippocrates §, there was a month called Ἀγρίανος, the 26th of which was the birthday of Hippocrates. The learned are generally agreed to consider Ἀγρίανος a corruption of Ἀγριάνιος; and Cos and Rhodes were so near each other, and possibly so closely connected in other respects, that they might have had a common calendar.

With respect to the Etymon of the name; the Ἀγριανοὶ and the Ἀγριᾶνες, according to Strabo<sup>h</sup>, were names of nations, neighbours of the Triballi or the Pæonians; and the Ἀγρίαια, as the name of a festival at Argos, is recognised by Hesychius: Ἀγρίαια· ἑορτὴ ἐν Ἀργεὶ ἐπὶ μίαν τῶν Πρώτου θυγατέρων: and the name of Ἀγριάνια, as that of a funereal solemnity of some kind or other at Argos, and of games of some kind at Thebes, is recognised also: Ἀγριάνια· νεκύσια παρὰ Ἀργείοις, καὶ ἀγῶνες ἐν Θήβαις. And did we but know that either parentalia or games were celebrated at Rhodes under such a name, nothing would have been better adapted to explain the name of Ἀγριάνιος in their calendar than this gloss.

In our opinion however the true explanation is to be discovered only by going back to the supposed origin of the island of Rhodes itself, according to the popular tradition and belief. We learn from the viith Olympic Ode of Pindar, that when the rest of the earth was already in existence, and even in the act of being divided among the other gods, the island of Rhodes in particular was not yet in being; not yet visible at least: at the utmost only growing up from the bottom of the sea—only in the process of formation. The fact then of such a belief respecting the origin of their own island, among the ancient Rhodians, being admitted; in

§ See Part i. Vol. ii. 650, 651.

<sup>h</sup> vii. 5. 108 b: and 133. 18. Ex Libri Septimi fine. cf. Hesych. Ἀγριᾶνες.

what state must they have considered it to have first appeared? Certainly not in that of an island already reclaimed, already available for social purposes; but at the utmost only in a capacity to become so. And what name for an island still unreclaimed, still in a state of nature, could the Greek language have supplied, but that of an *ἀγρία νῆσος*, or *ἀγριόνησος*? For though *ἄγριος* was most commonly used in Greek for a moral rather than a physical affection, (like that of a savage, in contradistinction to a gentle, disposition,) its first and proper sense was that of the qualities and characteristics of a state of nature, in contradistinction to those which might have been produced by art and culture. It denoted wild animals, in contradistinction to *τιθασσὰ*, or tame; wild trees, in opposition to *ἡμερα*, or garden trees; a superficial state of the country in its natural wildness, in contradistinction to one superinduced upon it by the labours and improvements of agriculture. *Ἄγριοσέλινον* was wild parsley in Greek; *ἀγριόσυκον* was the wild fig; *ἀγριόχοιρος* was the wild pig: and, on the same principle, a wild island, an island in a state of nature, uncultivated and unreclaimed, would be an *ἀγριόνησος*.

Now if the name of the *Ἄγριανοὶ* or *Ἄγριᾶνες* of antiquity must be ultimately derivable from *ἄγριος*, there is no reason why the *Ἄγριάνιος* of the Rhodian calendar should not be so too; but with this special reference to the circumstances under which the island itself came into existence. And the true explanation of the imposition of this name on the first month in the calendar will probably be that, according to the Rhodian tradition, this month was the birth-month of the island; the island first appeared in this month—though as yet only in the state in which it emerged from the womb of the sea. The *Ἄγριάνια* therefore might be the name of a parental or funereal solemnity at Argos; but in Rhodes it must have been much more probably the name of a festival, like the *Palilia* of the Romans, the *Natalis* of their island itself. We admit indeed that this explanation can be proposed only as conjectural, and as recommended if at all solely by its own probability: and the reader is at liberty to receive or to reject it, as he thinks best. We may sum up what we have to say of the name of this month, and of its site in the calendar, by observing, that the tradition relating to the



origin of the island being much older than the correction of the calendar, and having always fixed the birth of the island to the season of the year occupied by this month, the popular belief in the origin of the island naturally assigned the name of *Ἀγριάνιος* to the first month in the first Type of the calendar, which by the accident of its site was coinciding with the *Natalis Rhodi* at the time. The proper etymon of the name therefore, as taken from this relation, would be *ἄγριος*, or *ἀγριόνησος*; and the *Ἀγριάνια*, celebrated no doubt in this month, would be more properly the *Natales Rhodi*, than any thing else. To this coincidence however we may perhaps have occasion to refer again.

Type i. ii. = Type ii. x. *Βαδρόμιος* = *Ἀνθεστηριών*.

It is manifest that this name is the same as the Attic *Βοηδρομιών*. *Βαδρόμιος* was the Doric form of *Βοηδρόμιος*; and *Βαδρομιών* would have been the Doric form of *Βοηδρομιών*: and *Βαδρομιών* actually occurs in the calendar of *Lampsacus*<sup>i</sup>.

This name therefore of *Βαδρόμιος* in the Rhodian calendar, presenting externally so close a resemblance to that of *Βοηδρομιών* in the Attic, it is no wonder that those who were familiar with the Attic names should have taken it for granted that the Rhodian *Badromius* was only another name for the Attic *Boëdromion*—as even *Athenæus* is seen to have done. But as to the real agreement of these two months in their respective calendars—*Boëdromion* was the ninth month in the Attic calendar, and its site in the natural year was that of the Julian September; *Badromius* in the Rhodian, according to our list, was the second, and its site in the natural year was that of the Julian February. And that our list, in the order and place which it assigns to this month in particular, is correct, may be inferred from an ancient custom in the island of Rhodes, called that of the *Χελιδονισμὸς*—the stated time of which was in this month.

On the custom of the *Χελιδονισμὸς* at Rhodes.

*Χελιδονιστά*<sup>k</sup> οἱ τῆι χελιδόνι ἀγείροντες—And from this gloss it must always have been a legitimate inference that

<sup>i</sup> Corp. Inscript. ii. 1130 sqq. No. 3641 b. cf. *supra*, Part i. Vol. ii. page 691. Fragmentary Calendars, xiii.

<sup>k</sup> *Hesychius*.

the Greeks had a custom of collecting pence, or any thing else, in the name of the Swallow. There is a gloss in Suidas also, which is probably to be referred to the same custom: Χελιδόνιον μέλος· τῆς χελιδόνος. ἔστι δὲ αὐτῆς ἡ φωνὴ οὐ θρήνος, ἀλλ' ἄσμα ἐνδοτικὸν καὶ κλευστικὸν πρὸς ἔργα, διὰ τοῦτο (supple ὅτι) χεμῶνος οὔτε ἵπταται οὔτε φθέγγεται. But in the island of Rhodes in particular, this custom, according to tradition, was as old as Cleobulus of Lindus; to whom its introduction was attributed<sup>1</sup>: Καὶ χελιδονίζειν δὲ καλεῖται παρὰ Ῥοδίοις ἀγερμός τις ἄλλος, περὶ οὗ Θεόγνις φησιν ἐν δευτέρῳ περὶ τῶν ἐν Ῥόδῳ θυσίων, γράφων οὕτως· Εἶδος δέ τι τοῦ ἀγείρειν χελιδονίζειν οἱ Ῥόδιοι καλοῦσιν, ὃ γίνεται τῷ Βοηδρομιῶνι μῆνι· χελιδονίζειν δὲ λέγεται διὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς ἐπιφωνεῖσθαι—

Ἦλθ' ἦλθε χελιδῶν  
καλὰς ὥρας ἄγουσα  
(καὶ) καλοὺς ἐνιαυτοὺς,  
ἐπὶ γαστέρα λευκὰ  
ἐπὶ νῶτα μέλαινα.  
παλάθαν οὐ προκυκλεῖς  
ἐκ πίονος οἴκου,  
οἴνου τε δέπαστρον,  
τύρου τε κάνιστρον  
καὶ πυρῶν;  
ἅ χελιδῶν καὶ λεκιθίταν  
οὐκ ἀπωθείται. πότερ' ἀπίωμες ἢ λαβόμεθα;  
εἰ μὲν τι δώσεις· εἰ δὲ μὴ οὐκ ἐάσομες.  
ἦ τὰν θύραν φέρωμες ἦ θ' ὑπέρθυρον,  
ἦ τὰν γυναῖκα τὰν ἔσω καθημέναν·  
μικρὰ μὲν ἔστι, ῥαδίως μιν οἴσομες.  
ἐὰν φέρῃς δέ τι μέγα (γε) δῆ τι καὶ φέροις.  
ἄνοιγ' ἄνοιγε τὰν θύραν χελιδόνι·  
οὐ γὰρ γέροντές ἐσμεν ἀλλὰ παιδία.

τὸν δὲ ἀγερμὸν τοῦτον κατέδειξε πρῶτος Κλεόβουλος ὁ Λίνδιος, ἐν Λίνδῳ χρείας γενομένης συλλογῆς χρημάτων<sup>m</sup> \*.

\* It is singular that in Eustathius' allusion to this custom, which professes to be derived from Athenæus, the name of the Romans has got into the text, as it stands at present, instead of that of the Rhodians: Ad Od. Φ. 411: 1914. 43: Εἰ δέ τι χρὴ παρεβῆναι καὶ εἰς τὴν παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι ἀστεῖζομένην χελιδόνι παρώνυμον παιδιάν, χελιδονίζεῖν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἦν ἀγερμὸς γινόμενος Βοηδρομιῶνι μηνί, καλούμενος οὕτω διὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τηρικῶτα ἐπιφωνεῖσθαι, ἦλθ' ἦλθε κ', τ. λ.

Athenæus, viii. 59, mentions also the fact of a similar ἀγερμός at Rhodes,

<sup>1</sup> Athenæus, viii. 60.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Clemens Alex. Strom. iv. xix. § 125. p. 345.

The fact of such a custom in the island can leave no doubt that Badromius must have been the month in which the swallow usually appeared. And as the *Hirundinis adventus*, in all the Parapegmata of the Greeks, and for every parallel of latitude, was dated sometime in the last ten days of February, or the first ten of March, this must be decisive that the site of the month Badromius, in which this *χελιδο-νισμὸς* took place annually, was the same with that of the Julian February or March; just as that of Badromius in our list is seen to have been †.

in the name of the Crow, (τῇ κορώνῃ), which was called *κορώνισμα*, and the actors in it *κορωνισταί*: and he has given us too (from Phœnix of Colophon) the song usually sung on that occasion, in Seazon iambics. Cleobulus of Lindus, whom tradition handed down as the author of the *Χελιδονισμὸς* in Rhodes, and of the song which accompanied it, was famous for his songs and riddles in verse, "Δίσματα καὶ γρίφοι, εἰς ἔπη τρισ-χίλια: Diogenes Laërt. i. vi. ii. § 89: Suidas, Κλέοβουλος. As one of the seven wise men, he must have been a contemporary of Solon's, B. C. 592; and his daughter Cleobuline, who inherited her father's talent for the same kind of composition, (see supra, Vol. i. 64 note,) might have been contemporary with the Rhodian correction, B. C. 542, though Cleobulus himself could scarcely have been so. The custom in question was no doubt introduced by him while the calendar was still the primitive solar one; and it would naturally be attached to the second month of the primitive equable year, because that was the month which was coinciding with the time and season of the *Hirundinis adventus*, all through his lifetime.

In the *Argumenta vetera Carminum Theocriti*, p. lii. *Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν Βουκολικῶν*, a reference occurs to a custom at Syracuse, which seems to have resembled that of the *χελιδονισμὸς* at Rhodes. The following made part of the song then sung:

Δέξαι τὰν ἀγαθὰν τύχην, δέξαι τὰν ὑγίειαν,  
ἂν φέρομεν παρὰ τῆς θεοῦ, ἂν ἐκαλέσσατο τήνα.

† The first appearance of the swallow is a phenomenon to which frequent allusions occur in classical antiquity, and from a very early date. The following are instances of it.

De Homero<sup>1</sup>: Παραχειμάζων δὲ ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ ταῖς νομηγίαις προσπορευόμενος πρὸς τὰς οἰκίας τὰς εὐδαιμονεστάτας ἐλάμβανέ τι, αἰδῶν τὰ ἔπεα τάδε, ἃ καλεῖται *Εἰρεσιώνη*. The lines are given, eleven in number, ending—

Νεῦμαί σοι νεῦμαι ἐνιαύσιος, ὥστε χελιδῶν  
ἔστηκ' ἐν προθύρῳ κ', τ. λ.

<sup>1</sup> Vita, ap. Herod. xxxiii.

"Ἦιδετο δὲ τὰδε ἐν τῇ Σάμῳ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ὑπὸ τῶν παίδων, ὅτε ἀγείρουσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος—

Τόνδε μέτ' ὀρθρογὴ Πανδιονίς ὄρτο χελιδῶν  
εἰς φάος ἀνθρώποις, ἕαρος νέον ἰσταμένοιο 2—

Σὺ μὲν φίλη χελιδῶν  
ἐτησίη μολοῦσα  
θέρει πλέκεις καλιῆν,  
χειμῶνι δ' εἰς ἄφαντος  
ἦ Νεῖλον ἦ πὶ Μέμφιν 3—

Σκέψασθε παῖδες· οὐχ ὀράθ' ; ὦρα νέα, χελιδῶν 4—

ἽΟλόκληρος δὲ ἐστι παροιμία τὸ λεγόμενον, ἔστιν ἕαρος ἀρχή. δοκεῖ γὰρ πῶς ἅμα τῷ ἕαρι φαίνεσθαι ἡ χελιδῶν 4—Εἶπε δὲ πρὸ χελιδόνων, ἐπεὶ μετὰ τὴν χελιδόνα ἄβρωτοι αἱ κνίδαι . . . εἰκάσι δὲ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῇ πρὸ τοῦ ἕαρος χρῆσθαι 5—

"Οταν ἡρινὰ μὲν φωνῇ χελιδῶν  
ἐξομένη κελαδῆ, χορὸν δὲ μὴ ᾗ Μόρσιμος 6—

ἜΩ Ζεῦ χελιδῶν ἄρά ποτε φανήσεται 7 ;—

\* Ἀγγελε κλυτὰ ἕαρος ἀδυσόδμου κυανέα χελιδοῖ 8—

Καὶ μὲν τις φήνης ἀδινὸν γόον ἔκλυεν ἀνῆρ  
ὄρθριον ἀμφὶ τέκεσσ', ἡ ἀηδόνας αἰολοφώνου,  
ἡὲ καὶ εἰαρινῆσι χελιδόσιν ἐγγὺς ἔκυρσε  
μυρομέναις ἐὰ τέκνα, τὰ τέ σφισι ληῖσσαντο  
ἐξ εὐνῆς ἡ φῶτες ἀπηνέες ἡὲ δράκοντες 9.

ἽΩς δ' ὀπὸτ' ἀπτήνεσσι φέρει βόσιν ὀρταλίχοισι  
μητῆρ, εἰαρινοῦ Ζεφύρου πρωτάγγελος ὄρνις,  
οἱ δ' ἀπαλὸν τρύζοντες ἐπιθρόσκουσι καλιῆ  
γηθόστυνοι περὶ μητρί, καὶ ἰμείροντες ἐδωδῆς  
χείλος ἀναπτύσσουσιν, ἅπαν δ' ἐπὶ δῶμα λέλειπεν  
ἀνδρὸς ξεινοδόχοιο λίγα κλάζουσι νεοσσοῖς 10.

Πάντη δ' ὀρνίθων γενεῇ λιγύφωνον αἰεῖδι,  
ἀλκυόνες περὶ κῦμα, χελιδόνες ἀμφὶ μέλαθρα,  
κύκνος ἐπ' ὀχθαίσιν ποταμοῦ, καὶ ὑπ' ἄλσος ἀηδῶν 11.

ἽΟ πλὸς ὠραῖος· καὶ γὰρ λαλαγεῦσα χελιδῶν  
ἡδη μέμβλωκεν 12, χῶ χαρίεις ζέφυρος.

2 Hesiod. Opera et Dies, 566.

3 Anacreon, xxxiii. Εἰς χελιδόνα.

4 Aristophanes, Equites, 419.

5 Schol. in loc.

6 Ad 420.

7 Pax, 800.

8 Thesmophoriazusæ, 1.

9 Schol. ad Aves, 1410: Simonides,

lxviii. cf. ad 1301. 1417.

9 Oppian, Halieutica, i. 727.

10 Ibid. iii. 243.

11 Anthologia, i. 32. Melcager, xc.

De Vere, 16.

12 Ibid. i. 168. Leonidas Tarentinus, lvii.

This month therefore must have been the second in the Rhodian calendar, and must have corresponded to the Attic Anthesterion, and to the Julian February. As to the etymon of the name; it was no doubt the same as that of the Attic Βοηδρομιών—first, and properly βοηδρόμος—ultimately, βοῶ and δρόμος. We alluded to the tradition connected with this

Hoc geritur, zephyris primum inpellentibus undas,  
Ante novis rubeant quam prata coloribus, ante  
Garrula quam tignis nidum suspendat hirundo <sup>13</sup>.

Te, dulcis amice, reviset  
Cum Zephyris, si concedes, et hirundine prima <sup>14</sup>.

Tum blandi soles, ignotaque prodit hirundo,  
Et luteum celsa sub trabe fingit opus <sup>15</sup>.

Fallimur? an veris prænuntia venit hirundo;  
Nec metuit, ne qua versa recurrat hiems?  
Sæpe tamen, Procne, nimium properasse quereris;  
Virque tuo Tereus frigore lætus erit <sup>16</sup>.

Sic Pandionixæ repetunt ubi fida volucres  
Hospitia, atque larem bruma pulsante relictum <sup>17</sup>.

Ἦδη γὰρ Ζεφύροιο προάγγελος ἔγγυος ὄρη  
σχιζομένων καλύκων δροσεροῦς ἐμέθυσσεν ἀήτας,  
καὶ λιγυρῆ, μερόπεσσι συνέστιος, εἶαρι κῆρυξ  
ὄρθριον ὕπνον ἄμερσε λάλος τρύζουσα χελιδῶν  
ἀρτιφανῆς· καὶ γυμνὸν ἀπ' εὐόδοιο καλύπτρης  
εἰαριναῖς ἐγέλασσε λελουμένον ἄνθος ἐέρσαις  
κ', τ. λ. <sup>18</sup>

Εἰ δὲ γάμοις ἀδίκους με βίησεται, εἶδος ἀμείψω,  
μίξομαι ὀρνίθεσσι, καὶ ἵπταμένη Φιλομήλη,  
καὶ ῥόδον ἀγγέλλουσα καὶ ἀνθεμέοσαν ἐέρσην  
ἔσσομαι εἰαρινοῖο φίλη Ζεφύροιο χελιδῶν,  
φθεγγομένη λάλος ὄρνις ὑπωροφίης μέλος ἡχοῦς,  
ὄρχηθμῶ πτερόεντι περισκαίρουσα καλίην <sup>19</sup>.

Cf. Schol. in Platon. ii. 371. in Sophistam, 132. 24. ἄτρα: also Phot. Lex. Πύθου χελιδόνος.

<sup>13</sup> Virgil, Georgica, iv. 305.

<sup>14</sup> Horace, Epp. i. 7. 12.

<sup>15</sup> Ovid, Fasti, i. 157. cf. 149–160.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. ii. 853. of Feb. 24. cf. 857.

<sup>17</sup> Statius, Thebais, viii. 617.

<sup>18</sup> Nonnus, iii. 10.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. ii. 130. cf. ad xi. 495. De

Horis.

month, in the Attic calendar, on a former occasion<sup>n</sup>; and though it may be difficult to assign a reason at present for Solon's having given this name to the ninth month in his calendar, corresponding to the Julian September, while the Rhodians did so to the second in theirs, corresponding to February, possibly it might be that the event supposed to be commemorated by the name, happened in the second month of the primitive solar year, on the one hand, and at a time when that month was coinciding with September on the other; and Solon might choose to give the name to that month in his correction, which coincided with September, and the Rhodians to that in theirs, which coincided with the second of the primitive solar year: Solon, in assigning the name to the Attic Boëdromion, regarding the true time of the event in the natural or Julian year, the Rhodians, in giving it to their Boëdromion, its date and place in the Primitive calendar\*.

Type i. iii = Type ii. xi. Θευδαίσιος = Ἐλαφηβολιών.

The form of this name too is Doric, Θευδαίσιος for Θεοδαίσιος. And this too is peculiar to the Rhodian calendar, and, as far as we know, to one more, the Cretan; in which, as we have seen<sup>o</sup>, it occurred also. With respect to the etymon; in the first place it is resolvable into θεὸς and δαίσιος. And δαίσιος at first sight would resemble Δαίσιος, one of the names of the months in the Macedonian calendar, the etymon of which we traced up to δαῖς, *daps* or *epulum*. But that name was given to this month in its own calendar, because it was the month in which the barley was commonly ripe; and because it corresponded to the Attic Thargelion (of which the same fact held good), and both most properly to the Julian May: but this month in the Rhodian calendar, if we are right in our arrangements, must have corresponded to the

\* Or this name might have been given to the second month in the correction, B. C. 542—simply because it was the first in which military operations could be resumed after the winter; and for a reason, analogous to that, which (as we hope to see hereafter) induced the Delphians to give the name of Βοαθόος to the same month in their calendar; Βαδρόμιος and Βοαθόος, as so used respectively, having denoted much the same thing.

<sup>n</sup> Part i. vol. i. 116.

<sup>o</sup> Vol. iv. 553. Diss. iii.

Julian March, and to the Attic Elaphebolion; much too early for the month in which the barley was beginning to ripen, in any part of Greece.

In the next place, Hesychius has a gloss, in explanation of the word Ἰρόχια τὰ Θεοδαΐσια, οἱ δὲ ἑορτὴν οἱ δὲ ἔρια—from which it may be inferred that the Θεοδαΐσια was another name for the Ἰρόχια, and *vice versa*; upon which coincidence it is to be observed that though Ἰρόχια in the text of Hesychius at present has the rough breathing, and therefore implies some connection between the Θεοδαΐσια, so explained, and Ἥρα, Juno—the old reading was Ἰρόχια, with the smooth breathing, and that would imply nothing more than a general connection of the Θεοδαΐσια with the spring, instead of a particular connection with Ἥρα: such as would suit the site of the Rhodian Θεωδαΐσιος, in our list, in which it corresponds partly to March and partly to April. It confirms this, that there was a feast so called in the Cretan calendar, τὰ Θεωδαΐσια ρ, and a month called Θεωδαΐσιος, likewise; and these two were no doubt connected; and the former was celebrated in the latter. And there too it was a month of the spring—the Julian limits of which were March 24 and April 23.

In the next place, this word δαΐσιος in Greek, whether in composition, or out of composition, *per se*, is ambiguous. It might be derivable in a given instance from δαΐς, *epulum*; but it might also be derivable from δαίω, *divido*. Γεωδαΐσια occurs in Greek † pretty much in the same sense as that of Γεωμετρία, the division or measurement of the earth—that is, of the surface of the earth: and ἐπιδαΐσιος occurs in Callimachus, in the sense of allotted or apportioned:

Τῷ τοι καὶ γνωτοὶ προτερηγενέες περ ἔόντες  
οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐμέγηραν ἔχειν ἐπιδαΐσιον οἶκον †.

which the scholiast explains by Μεμερισμένοι. He is speaking of the rest of the inmates of Olympus, though older than Zeus, yet agreeing to concede to him as his proper lot or portion the undisputed mastery of the abode of them all in common. It is evident then that Θεοδαΐσιος or Θεωδαΐσιος in

† Diss. iii. Vol. iv. 553.

‡ Aristotle, *Metaphysica*.

‡ Hymnus in Jovem, 58.

Greek would be just as derivable from θεὸς and δαίω, *divido*, as from θεὸς and δαῖς, *daps* or *epulum*. And since it appears from Hesychius<sup>s</sup> that Θεοδόσια might have the sense of (τὰ) ὑπὸ θεοῦ δεδομένα—so, on the same principle, might Θεοδαΐσια have that of τὰ ὑπὸ θεῶν δεδασμένα.

Here then it is necessary again to refer to the ancient popular fable of the Rhodians, respecting the origin of their own island, and the way in which it came to be the peculiar λάχος or portion of the sun: the substance of which, in brief, was this, That when the rest of the gods of Olympus were dividing the earth among them, the island of Rhodes was not yet in existence, and therefore could not as yet have been the subject of such a division, along with the rest of the earth; and the sun, to whom it was ultimately assigned, was not present, along with the rest of the gods, when the division was going on. But the fable added, that Rhodes was even then growing up from the bottom of the sea; and it was even then agreed between the sun and the rest of the gods, that when it emerged into the light of day at last, it should be his *extra sortem*. Now it is a curious coincidence that Θεοδαΐσιος being supposed the month in which the gods were thus dividing the rest of the earth, and the month in which the island of Rhodes was beginning to grow up from the bottom of the sea, Ἀγριάνιος, the month in which we have already seen reason to date the actual nativity of the island, was the tenth month from Θεοδαΐσιος; and nothing would be more natural than to conclude that if the island was just beginning to be conceived in the womb of the sea in Θεοδαΐσιος, it would be born (i. e. actually appear above the surface) in Ἀγριάνιος.

The name of the month next to this in the Rhodian calendar, and the reason why it was so called, will prove, we hope by and by, that the authors of these names, for their proper calendar, were not ignorant of the primitive tradition, which dated the *Natale Mundi* in April, and very probably on the 24th or 25th of April. But they must also have considered the case of their own island an exception to that of the rest of the world; and the island itself conceived in Θεοδαΐσιος—

<sup>s</sup> In voce.



when the rest of the world was being divided among the rest of the gods; and born in Ἀγριάνιος—when it became the property of the sun. And, as in other cases of such mystical births as these, the interval between the conception and the birth, according to the precedent set by the Egyptians, appears to have been assumed at 280 days<sup>t</sup>; let us reckon back 280 days from the second or third of Agrianius, in the second year of the first cycle of the Rhodian correction, Dec. 28 or 29, B. C. 542, and we shall come to March 23 or 24, B. C. 542, the 17th or 18th of Θευδαίσιος, in the first year. And these dates would be remarkable, as being the epoch of the sphere of Mazzaroth; March 24, its epoch before B. C. 672, March 23 its epoch after. They may lead therefore to the inference that the epoch of the Θευδαίσια in question, according to the authors of this fable, was the epoch of the sphere of Mazzaroth; and that while the true *Natale Mundi* in general was still the old and traditional one of April 24 or 25, (the epoch of the Krion of the beginning of things,) that of this partition of the earth and its surface, all but the island of Rhodes, was that of the Krion of Mazzaroth. Certain at least it is that the epoch of the Theodæsius of the Cretan calendar was this of the Krion of Mazzaroth also, March 24; and that coincidence, between the name of the month and the epoch of the month so called, was probably not fortuitous.

Type i. iv. = Type ii. xii. Δάλιος = Μουνηχιών.

The name of Δάλιος, as that of a month, occurs nowhere, so far as we know, except in this Rhodian calendar, and in that of Tauromenium in Sicily<sup>v</sup>. The name itself is the Doric form of Δήλιος—

Ἦ ρά μιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἡγάπευν Ἀπόλλων<sup>w</sup>.

Μῆ μοι κραναὰ νεμεσάσαι

Δᾶλος, ἐν ᾧ κέχυμαι<sup>x</sup>.

In this name consequently there must be ultimately some reference to the island of Delos; and we shall probably not be mistaken if we suppose it was given to this month either in honour of the Delian Apollo, or in honour of the island of

<sup>t</sup> See supra, Vol. iv. 134.

<sup>v</sup> Supra, Vol. ii. page 438.

<sup>w</sup> Theocritus, Epigr. xix. 4. De Archilocho.

<sup>x</sup> Pindar, Isthm. i. 3.

Delos, or lastly, with a special and particular reference to the connection between this month and the festival of the Δήλια, celebrated at Delos also. Now with respect to the first of these explanations; it is an objection to the supposed derivation of the name of this month from any of the titles of Apollo, and especially that of the Delian—that the month Δήλιος in the Rhodian calendar in that case should have corresponded to the month Θαργηλιών in the Attic; whereas in reality it appears to have corresponded to the month Μουνυχιών. It is also an objection to it, that Apollo in the estimation of the Rhodians was the same with the sun, and the month in their calendar sacred to the sun was that in which the Ἄλεια, or feast of the sun, was celebrated; and this, as we shall see by and by, was the month Ἰακύνθιος, not the month Δάλιος.

With respect to the second, which would derive this name from the island of Delos, it is virtually the same with the third, which would derive it from the name of the Δήλια: for it makes no difference to the etymon of the name, whether the name was that of the island, or that of the festival celebrated in the island, and called by the name of the island. And this, in our opinion, is the true explanation; that the month was so called because it was that in which the festival of the Delia was annually celebrated. For that was a solemnity of very great antiquity, and of equal sanctity and importance; in which not only the inhabitants of the Cyclades round about Delos, but those of the islands off the coast of Asia Minor, and the Greeks settled on the continent also, had a common interest; and for the celebration of which they met every year at Delos. Nor could anything be more probable *a priori* than that, when any of them were giving names to the months of their calendar, they should have given the name of the Delian month to that in which this festival of the Delia usually fell out.

We reserve any further explanation of this ancient and national festival of the Greeks for a future opportunity. All that we shall say about it at present is that its proper season in the natural year is determinable to the spring; and that the final end of its institution, like that of the Italian and Roman Palilia, appears to have been to commemorate the beginning of things: and, though we have no absolute as-

surance of the fact from testimony, yet that there is reason to believe the date to which it was actually attached at first was that of the *Natale mundi* itself, April 25. It is certain at least that, both in the Rhodian calendar, which we are now considering, and in the Tauromenian or Naxian, which we considered before, the limits of this Delian month were April 5 and May 5; and that the traditional date of the *Natale mundi*, April 25, in the normal or rectified state of each, (i. e. in the first year of its proper cycle,) was the 21st of this month.

Type i. v. = Type ii. i. Ἄρταμίτιος = Θαργηλιών.

This name also is the Doric form of Ἄρτεμίσιος. It was consequently derived from Ἄρταμης, the Doric form of Ἄρτεμης. A month of this name, as we have seen, occurred in many other calendars besides the Rhodian, and in all of them as sacred to the Grecian Ἄρτεμης. And the birth of the Grecian Ἄρτεμης, like that of the Grecian Apollo, after a time at least, if not from the first, being generally supposed to have borne date in the Attic Thargelion; the site of this month in those other instances was commonly found to have corresponded to that of the Attic Thargelion. This coincidence holds good in the present instance. The limits of the Rhodian Artamitius, Type i. Cycle i. 1, were May 5 and June 3; those of the Attic Thargelion, at the same point of time, Cycle ix. 3, were April 25 and May 24; only ten days earlier: not more than the necessary difference at that time between the epochs of Type i. and those of Type iii. of the Octaëteric correction in general.

This month Artamitius therefore was as necessarily the fifth month in its proper calendar, at first, as that of Thargelion in the Attic; and when the cycle of the calendar was changed by the adoption of the enneakaidecaëteris instead of the octaëteris, if the head of the calendar was shifted at the same time, the place of this month in the order of the calendar, from that time forward, would depend on the choice of the month which was to be the head of the calendar, and the beginning of the year, in the Metonic correction. And that Artamitius itself must have been fixed upon for that pur-

pose, may be inferred from the testimony of the same inscriptions to which we have so often had occasion to refer.

We observed before<sup>z</sup>, that in some of these instances, besides the name of office, and the name of the month, others also occurred, accompanied with certain symbols (the caduceus of antiquity, an olive-chaplet, a mouse, a garland of flowers, a dolphin and anchor, and the like); the best explanation of which is that they were the names and private marks of the individuals or the firms by which these Diotæ were made and exported. There are however two cases of this kind<sup>a</sup>, to which this explanation would not apply; cases in which nothing appears but the name of office or the name of the month, accompanied over and above with a symbol of a particular kind; the name of the month in each instance being that of Artamitius, and the symbol which accompanies it in each being that of a *star*.

Now a star would be the most natural symbol of a constellation imaginable; and to an ancient Rhodian, aware that the civil year of his own countrymen began at the heliacal rising of the Pleiads, such a symbol, in conjunction with the month Artamitius, would be perfectly intelligible. But in itself the emblem of a star would be ambiguous; and *a priori* would not appear to denote one constellation, or one star, more than another: and it is very observable that, in one of the above instances<sup>b</sup>, as if on purpose to limit and define the symbol, the letter T is annexed to the star. The Pleiads being one of the constellations of the sign of Taurus, and this letter being the first in the name of Taurus; the most probable explanation of the addition is that it was intended to limit the application of this symbol to the sign of Taurus, and to designate this star as one of those of that sign—the Pleiades or the Hyades,—and as the most remarkable of the two, the Pleiads.

The heliacal rising of the Pleiades is invariably assigned by the ancients as the signal of the arrival of that season in the natural year, when the sea was to be considered open again, not only for commercial enterprise, but also for political purposes, and naval and military expeditions: and an insular people like the Rhodians, who had begun to make a figure

<sup>z</sup> Supra page 178.

<sup>a</sup> No. 197. 438. cf. 193.

<sup>b</sup> No. 438.

before B. C. 382, and were aspiring at still greater distinction, not merely as a commercial, but also as a political, community, had a direct interest in that season of the year. And as the date of this phenomenon, assigned by the ancient astronomers, for such a parallel as that of Rhodes, was neither much earlier nor much later than the 6th of May, it is evident that it must always have happened in the Rhodian Artamitius; and in Type ii. of their calendar, such as is exhibited in our scheme, *supra*, it might without any material error have been assumed as the first of Artamitius, May 6 itself. It is not probable that any of these Figuline inscriptions were older than B. C. 382; and if they were all later, then this symbol of the star, along with the name of Artamitius and the name of office, which appears in some of them, may obviously be understood of the month in which the phenomenon of the heliacal rising was of stated occurrence; and consequently the first month of the calendar itself\*.

\* A further argument of the site of this month Artamitius at Rhodes, relatively to the Julian calendar, may be derived from its relation to the equable year also. An inscription of Naxos is extant (Corp. Ins. ii. 1079, Appendix, No. 2416 c), in which a certain form of words, *mutatis mutandis*, occurs four times: 'Ἐπὶ δημιουργοῦ Ἀντιόχου, ἱερέω(ς δὲ) τῆς Ῥόδου Ἀρχέλεω, μῆνός Ἀρτεμισίωνος, ταμείοντος Θε(ν,β)ούλου, ἤρξαν τὰ Σαραπήϊα Πανκριτος . . . καὶ Κλειάειτος: from which it is an obvious inference that it commemorated the celebration of the Σαραπήϊα under a different Demiurge, in four successive years; i. e. one cycle of the revolution of the equable in the Julian cycle of leap-year. And though Naxos must be supposed to have had some time or other a calendar of its own, Mr. B., the editor of this part of the Corpus Inscript., conjectures with good reason that Naxos at this time was subject to Rhodes, and there was no difference between the Naxian calendar and the Rhodian: on which supposition, the Naxian Ἀρτεμισίων must have agreed with the Rhodian Ἀρταμίτιος, and the Sarapeia, four times celebrated in the former, must have been four times celebrated simultaneously in the latter also.

Now we have shewn (Fasti Catholici, iv. 410. 420.) that the proper Egyptian date of the Sarapeia in their own calendar was Pachon 2: and the limits of the Rhodian Artamitius from B. C. 382 downwards being assumed as May 6 and June 4, when these inscriptions were recorded Pachon 2 must have been falling between these Julian terms. Now that was the case between Nab. 572, B. C. 177, and Nab. 692, B. C. 57. Nor is it probable that these inscriptions were older than B. C. 177, though they might be than B. C. 57.

Type i. vi. = Type ii. ii. Πάναμος = Σκιρροφοριών.

A month of this name too has occurred in various calendars, and always about the same season of the natural year, mid-summer, and corresponding to the same months in the Julian, June and July. The etymon of the name was explained in illustration of the month so called in the Macedonian calendar<sup>c</sup>, and shown to have been derived from the physical fact of the ripening and reaping of barley, or wheat, in this month, on the most general scale, for any of the parallels of the ancient Greece. The limits of the Rhodian Panamus in our scheme are June 3, and July 3; and the corresponding Attic month was Σκιρροφοριών: and that being the case, there can be no doubt that for the climate of Rhodes, not only barley harvest, but very possibly wheat harvest, must have fallen out in this month<sup>d</sup>, though it is sufficient to explain its name, that it was the stated month of barley harvest.

It is far from improbable that this name was given to the sixth month in the Rhodian calendar, and to the seventh in the Corinthian, at the same time, B. C. 542; for it occurs in the Corinthian calendar also, and occupies there the place of the seventh month. If so, it was probably given to the sixth in the one, as the month of barley harvest, and to the seventh in the other, as that of wheat harvest. And that this distinction, in any case, must have been as old as the Rhodian correction itself, must be inferred from the fact that, as appears from the testimony of these figuline inscriptions also, the name and place of the intercalary month in the same calendar were those of a Πάναμος δεύτερος. The intercalary month would naturally be either the twelfth repeated, or the sixth; so that if the Rhodian Πάναμος was not the twelfth month in its proper calendar, it must have been the sixth. To this subject however we shall have occasion to return, when we come to speak of the month Διόσθνος.

Type i. vii. = Type ii. iii. Πεδαγείτννος = Ἑκατομβαιών.

The form of this name too is Doric, Πεδαγείτννος, for Μεταγείτννος, or Μεταγείτνιος; and as Μεταγείτνιος would

<sup>c</sup> Vol. iii. 47.

<sup>d</sup> Cf. Vol i. page 144 sqq.

have been only accidentally different from *Μεταγειτριών*. at first sight it would seem to be a natural inference from the name, that the month so called in the Rhodian calendar must have corresponded to the Attic *Μεταγειτριών*. But we have already seen, from the case of the Rhodian *Βαδρόμιος*, that the resemblance of names in this calendar to others in the Attic is no proof of their agreement with the Attic; and in reality, to judge from our own scheme, this month in the Rhodian must have corresponded to *Πεκατομβæον* in the Attic. The limits of the Rhodian *Pedageitnyus*, cycle i. 1. of Type i. were July 3–August 1: those of the Attic *Πεκατομβæον*, cycle ix. 3, were June 23–July 22, only ten days earlier.

There is reason in fact to suspect that the name of this month in the Rhodian calendar was not originally *Πεδαγείτριος*, but *Ἐκατομβαιῶς*, or some such name, the same with that of the Attic month so called. The proof of this point indeed is not very clear; but there is something like evidence of it in the following extract from an epistle of Lynkeus, the brother of Duris the historian, which occurs in *Athenæus*<sup>e</sup>: *Λυγκεύς δ' ἐν τῇ πρὸς Διαγόραν ἐπιστολῇ, ἐπαιῶν τὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν γινόμενον Νικοστράτειον βότρυν καὶ ἀρτιπιθεὶς αὐτῷ τοὺς Ῥωδιακοὺς, φησι· Τῷ δ' ἐκεῖ καλουμένῳ βότρῳ Νικοστρατείῳ τὸν Ἰππώνιον ἀντεκτρέφουσι βότρυι, ὅς ἀπὸ Ἐκατομβαιῶνος μηνὸς ὥσπερ ἀγαθὸς οἰκέτης διαμένει τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχων εὖνοιαν.* Lynkeus himself was of Samos, and we cannot be sure by what calendar he reckoned in this instance, whether the Samian, or the Attic, or the Rhodian; but, as he was speaking of a Rhodian grape, and of the time of its becoming ripe, and of the length of its continuance in that state, it is most natural to suppose it was by the Rhodian. If so, there was still in his time, or had been before his time, a month in that calendar, the name of which was *Ἐκατομβαιῶν*, or something only accidentally different from it; and therefore in this place in the calendar, that of the seventh on our list: for none other could have been open to it. The only question in this case will be, whether the grape, and for the climate of Rhodes, could be supposed to have been fit for eating in the viith month on our list, the limits of which were July 3 and August 1.

Now the time when the grape began to change colour, (*περκάζειν, variare se*), in other words, to ripen, for any of the climates of Greece, as we have seen <sup>f</sup>, is ordinarily represented as the beginning of the *δπώρα*; and the beginning of the *δπώρα* as the heliacal rising of Orion: the date of which, for this epoch, and for these parallels, was sometime in the first or second week in July, the first decad of the Rhodian *Πεδαγείτννος*. It is manifest therefore that a forward kind of grape, and in so favourable a climate as that of the island of Rhodes, might be already fit to eat early in this month, certainly before the end of it. Prosper Alpinus tells us, he himself had seen grapes in Egypt, near Cairo, ready to be gathered as early as the middle of May; and there was not so much difference between the climate of Egypt, about Cairo, and that of Rhodes, that the same thing might not have been possible in the latter, two months later.

On the other hand, that there must also have been a month called *Πεδαγείτννος*, in the Rhodian calendar, appears not only from these Figuline inscriptions, but also from Porphyry, *Περὶ ἐμψύχων ἀποχῆς*, whose testimony we shall have occasion to produce by and by; and if so, it must have been the seventh. The question is then, if the seventh month in the Rhodian calendar had once the name of *Ἑκατομβαῖος*, or some other like it, how it came to lose that, and to acquire the name of *Πεδαγείτννος* in its stead.

Now the etymon of this name, as substantially the same with the Attic *Μεταγειτιῶν*, could have been nothing but *πέδα*, the same as *μέτα*, and *γείτννος*, the same with *γειτῶν*, or *γειτιῶν*; and a name so compounded must always have implied a reference to the relations of neighbourhood—some change of abode from one locality to another, and some consequent change in these relations. It points therefore, *virtute termini*, to the only event in Rhodian history, known to us at present, sufficiently interesting and important to have given a name to any month in the calendar—that of the *συννοικισμὸς* of Rhodes; when the three principal cities, Lindus, Ialysus, and Camirus, with their respective inhabitants, before independent of each other, and living apart, were formed

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Vol. i. 385 note. 244 and 298 note.

<sup>g</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 427 note.



into one city, and one community, under the name of 'Ρόδος: a change which laid the foundation of the subsequent prosperity and greatness of the island\*.

\* Skylax of Caryandus<sup>1</sup>: 'Ρόδος κατὰ τοῦτο νῆσος τρίπολις, ἀρχαία πόλις. καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ πόλεις αἶδε, Ἰαλυσὸς Λίνδος Κάμειρος—Habitata urbibus Lindo, Camiro, Ialyso, nunc Rhodo<sup>2</sup>. Mythology attributed the foundation of these three cities to three of the Heliadae, the sons of Helius and Rhodos; but they were really founded, as we shall see hereafter, by Telepolemus, the son of Hercules.

Camirus, Lindus, and Ialysus are recognised by Thucydides, as still distinct from, and independent of, each other, at the end of B. C. 412, or the beginning of B. C. 411<sup>3</sup>; but Diodorus dates their *συννοικισμὸς* only four years later<sup>4</sup>, in the year of Euctemon, B. C. 408–407: Οἱ δὲ τὴν 'Ρόδον νῆσον κατοικοῦντες, καὶ Ἰηλυσὸν καὶ Λίνδον καὶ Κάμειρον, μετῴκισθησαν εἰς μίαν πόλιν τὴν νῦν καλουμένην 'Ρόδον. It may be questioned however whether it happened really in B. C. 408, or in B. C. 407; particularly as there is reason to believe that Lysander, the leading man among the Lacedæmonians at this time, was concerned in it. Diodorus dates his appointment to the command of the fleet for the first time, B. C. 408<sup>5</sup>; and yet it appears from Xenophon<sup>6</sup>, that it must have been in the spring of B. C. 407. He was superseded the next year, by Callicratidas<sup>7</sup>, not long after the lunar eclipse, April 15<sup>8</sup>; and he was reappointed, at the request of the allies, B. C. 406 *exeunte*, or B. C. 405 *ineunte*<sup>9</sup>. On the first occasion he assumed the command at Rhodes; on the second at Ephesus. It is probable therefore, that the actual date of the *συννοικισμὸς*, if the consequence of his advice and his influence, was near midsummer, B. C. 407—which would still be in the year of Euctemon, according to the common rule, though not so, according to the rule of Diodorus.

Aristides the sophist, alluding to the earthquake which laid Rhodes waste in his time<sup>10</sup>, dates the *συννοικισμὸς* 'Επὶ Λυσάνδρου, 600 years before<sup>11</sup>. The city of Rhodes was already in being B. C. 391–390<sup>12</sup>: and from that time forward its existence is matter of history. The most extraordinary circumstance, which has been handed down concerning the *συννοικισμὸς*, is that the same architect planned and laid out the city of Rhodes on this occasion, B. C. 407, who had done the same thing for the Piræus 85 years before, B. C. 492. See supra, p. 33. Τὴν δὲ 'Ρόδον τὴν πόλιν, says Eustathius<sup>13</sup>, ὕστερόν φησιν ('Αθήναιος scil.) κτισθῆναι κατὰ τὰ Πελοποννησιακὰ ἐπὶ ἀρχιτέκτονος ὑφ' οὗ καὶ ὁ Ἀπτικός λιμὴν ὁ Πειραιεύς:

1 Geographi Min. i. 38.

2 Pliny, H: N. v. 36. cf. Dionys. Perieg. 504, and Eustath. in loc.: Syn-cellus, 490, 11.

3 viii. 44. 39. 60. cf. 6.

4 xiii. 75. cf. 68. cf. Strabo, xiv. 2. 198 b: Conon. Διηγ. μζ'. apud Phot. Cod. 186.

5 xiii. 68. 7c.

6 Hell. i. v. 1.

7 i. vi. 1. 8 Ibid.

9 ii. 1. 6–10. cf. i. 15–22.

10 xliii. 'Ροδιακός, 797 sqq.

11 816. 19–817. 5: 810. 8.

12 Xenoph. Hellenica, iv. viii. 2c–24.

13 Ad Il. B. 656. 315. 20.

The date of this event, according to Diodorus Siculus<sup>h</sup>, was the year of Euctemon; which, agreeably to his rule of reckoning, entered Jan. 1, B.C. 408, according to the common one, Hecatombæon 1, July 21, the same year. In the calendar of Rhodes this year answered to Cycle xvii. 7, and the date of the seventh month was June 25, only four days later than that of the Attic Skirrhophorion, June 21. We collect from the testimony of Porphyry, above referred to, that the 6th of the Rhodian Metageitnion in his time corresponded to June 30, and therefore the first to June 25: so that the Metageitnion of his time would seem to have been altogether the same with the viith month of the calendar in the year of the *συνοικισμός*. And though the month of which he was then speaking was a solar one, in the sense of a Julian, and this of the epoch of the *συνοικισμός* must have been a lunar one; still there can be no doubt that the solar Metageitnion of Porphyry's time must have been regularly derivable from the lunar of preceding times.

It is probable therefore that, down to the date of the consolidation of the people of Rhodes into one community, the name of the seventh month in their calendar was the Doric form of the Attic Hecatombæon, Ἐκατομβᾶς or Ἐκατομβεύς—and after that event, both on account of the importance of the event itself to the political consequence of the island, and also possibly because it took place in this very month, it received the name of Πεδαγείτινος—implying the month of the change of neighbourhood, and of the relations of vicinity, on a large scale. And yet it would not follow even from this fact that it would altogether lose its ancient name; or that in such an allusion to it, as that in the Epistle of Lynkeus, above referred to, and on such a subject as that of the Epistle, though very probably an hundred years later than the change of its style, it might not still be called by its ancient name.

i. e. Hippodamus. And yet it seems almost incredible, that the same person should have been living and capable of such a work as this, both B.C. 492, or soon after, and B.C. 407. For if he was not more than 20, B.C. 492, he could not have been less than 105, B.C. 407.

<sup>h</sup> xiii. 75. cf. 68. Also Marmor Parium, lxiii.

Type i. viii. = Type ii. iv. Ἰακίνθιος = Μεταγειρνιών.

We learn from the testimony of another Inscription, which we hope to produce by and by, as well as from these Figuline Inscriptions, that there must have been a month of this name in the Rhodian calendar; and it may be inferred from the same inscription, that there was six months' interval between this month Ἰακίνθιος and the month Βαδρόμιος: as there is in our list, and as there could not fail to be if Βαδρόμιος was originally the second, and Ἰακίνθιος the eighth.

The name itself, so far as we have yet discovered, occurs only in one other calendar, the calendar of Thera<sup>1</sup>. With respect to its etymon; there can be no mistake in deriving it from Ἰάκινθος; and Ἰάκινθος in Greek was both a proper name, (that of a person,) and an appellative, that is, the name of a flower, which we call hyacinth too—and the Latins called properly vaccinium\*. Now to derive the name of the Rhodian Ἰακίνθιος from the flower would be liable to the objection that the hyacinth everywhere among the Greeks was a flower of the early spring; but this month Hyakinthius was one of the summer quarter, when all the flowers of spring must long have been over. To derive it from Ἰάκινθος, as a proper name, would be admissible; could it be shewn that there was any connection between the person so called, and the island of Rhodes.

But the Ἰακίνθια was also the name of one of the feasts of the Greeks of former times. At least in the Spartan calendar there was one so called, of great antiquity, and corresponding sanctity; and what is more, sacred to the sun, and celebrated in that month of its own calendar, which was sacred to the sun also—the Spartan Ἐκατομβεὺς, answering to the Attic Ἐκατομβαιών. There is no doubt that the Μῆν

\* Dioscorides, iv. 63: Ἰάκινθος (οἱ δὲ ἑλωνίαις, οἱ δὲ πορφυρανθεὺς, Ῥωμαῖοι οὐακκίνουμ, οἱ δὲ οὐλκίνουμ) κ', τ. λ. Virgil, Eclogæ, ii. 18:

Alba ligustra cadunt, vaccinia nigra leguntur:

which Servius, in loc., explains of the violet, though Virgil himself elsewhere distinguishes the vaccinium from the violet—

Et nigræ violæ sunt, et vaccinia nigra.

Eclog. x. 39.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. 673.

Ἰακίνθιος in any of the calendars of the ancient Greeks might have derived its name from the Ἰακίνθια; and as the solemnity so called was much older than the correction of the Rhodian calendar, B. C. 542, it is far from improbable that as the eighth month in that correction was sacred to the sun, and the stated month of a solemnity very similar to the Spartan Ἰακίνθια, in honour of the sun, the Rhodians might choose to give this month the name of Ἰακίνθιος.

The Doric form of ἥλιος, (the Greek for the sun,) being ἄλιος, the name of a festival, dedicated to the sun, according to analogy should have been Ἄλεια; but at Rhodes the Doric form of the solemnity was Ἄλεια, and the corresponding form of the name of the sun must have been Ἐλος, not Ἄλιος: and the Grammarians remark upon this as an exceptional case<sup>d</sup>: Εἰς δὲ τὰ καινὰ περιεκτικὰ τακτέον καὶ τὸ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἀθηναίου χορηγείον τοῦ Διονύσου, ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ παρ' ἄλλοις Ἄλειον, ὅπερ ἦν Ἡλίου ἱερὸν κατὰ Ῥοδίους. Δωρικὴ δὲ φασιν ἢ τοιαύτη φράσις. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ εἰρημένον Ῥοδιακῶς ἄλειον κοινῶς ἠλιεῖον λέγεται κ', τ. λ. In the sophist Aristides it is Ἄλια<sup>e</sup>. It is certain however that this was the name of the feast of the Sun at Rhodes, and of the principal solemnity in the Rhodian calendar. Θεσπιεῖς τε, observes Athenæus<sup>f</sup>, τὰ Ἐρωτίδια τιμῶσι, καθάπερ Ἀθήναια Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ Ὀλύμπια Ἠλεῖοι, Ῥοδιοί τε τὰ Ἄλεια: from which it must be inferred that the Ἄλεια were notoriously as characteristic of the Rhodians as the Παναθήναια of the Athenians, or the Ὀλύμπια of the Eleans. And without anticipating at present what will better be reserved for future consideration, with respect to the antiquity of this institution in Rhodes, and the day of the month to which it was originally attached—we will observe only that in the Macedo-Hellenic calendar of later times its stated date was the 24th of Gorpæus; and the Julian date of the solar Gorpæus being July 25, the Julian date of the 24th was August 7. And this solar form of the Macedo-Hellenic calendar having been derived from the older lunar one; if the stated date of the Ἄλεια in the former was August 7—*mutatis mutandis*, and within certain limits, it must have been the same in the latter.

<sup>d</sup> Eustathius, ad Odys. Z. 266. 1562. 58.

<sup>e</sup> Oratio xliii. Ῥοδιακός. i. 808. 21.

<sup>f</sup> xiii. 12.

We may assume then that the stated month of the *Ἄλεια*, in the lunar calendar of the Rhodians also, must have been one which coincided more or less with the Julian August; and if so, the month *Ῥακίνθιος*, the limits of which were Aug. 1 and Aug. 31. The Spartan *Ῥακίνθια* were attached to the sixth of *Ἐκατομβεύς*; and the limits of that month in the Spartan calendar were July 15 and August 13. But this date followed the moon, and therefore was liable to pass out of the month of July into the month of August; and both these solemnities, both the *Ῥακίνθια* at Sparta, and the *Ἄλεια* at Rhodes, being annual, it could not fail to happen repeatedly that they would be going on together, or one very soon before or after the other. It is conceivable therefore, that though the Rhodians did not think proper to give the name of the *Ῥακίνθια* to their old and long-established festival in honour of the sun; yet, as the Spartan *Ῥακίνθια* and their own *Ἄλεια* were so much akin in other respects, if they did not determine to give the month in which they were celebrated the name of *Ἄλειος*, they might consider none so suitable for it as *Ῥακίνθιος* \*.

\* This conclusion respecting the date of the *Ἄλεια* in the Rhodian calendar is confirmed by the only case of the celebration of those games, which happens to be on record in history; those viz. of the year in which Eumenes, king of Pergamus, went to Rome, before the war with Perseus, on purpose to denounce him to the Roman senate. The sympathies of the Greeks of the time in general, and certainly those of the Rhodians in particular, for some reason or other, before this war, were in favour of Perseus; and the Rhodians are said to have marked their disapprobation of the step which Eumenes was taking by refusing to receive his *Θεωρία* at their *Ἄλεια*—i. e. to allow his chariots to contend for the prize at these games. And this fact is demonstrative that the stated time of the *Ἄλεια* must have been later in the year than this visit of Eumenes to Rome.

The year is determined by Livy<sup>1</sup> to the consular year of C. Popillius Lænas, P. Ælius Ligus, U. C. 582 of Varro—B. C. 173—172—two years before the beginning of the war. Valerius Antias at least<sup>2</sup> dated the arrival either of Eumenes himself, or of Attalus his brother, at Rome, this year: and that being the case, as this consular year began on the Ides of March, U. C. 582, December 30, B. C. 173, Eumenes, we may presume, must have come in the course of the summer of B. C. 172, Attalus, his

<sup>1</sup> Lib. xlii. 9—18. cf. 10.

<sup>2</sup> xlii. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i. 409 sqq.

Type i. ix. = Type ii. v. Καρνείος = Βοηδρομιών.

The name of this month has come before us in the Spar-

brother, in the spring or summer of B. C. 171. The 24th of the Rhodian Ἰακίνθιος, the same year, (Period iii. 59,) corresponded to August 15, B. C. 172: and Eumenes, it is probable, must have been already arrived at Rome so much earlier in the summer than this date, that the news both of his arrival, and of the nature of the errand on which he had come, might have reached Rhodes, in time to exclude his Θεωρία from these games the same year.

It is well known too that when Eumenes was returning home again after this visit, his life was attempted at Delphi by subornation of Perseus; and he narrowly escaped falling a victim to his revenge. His motive in visiting Delphi, as Livy says, was to sacrifice there; but not, so far as it appears, to consult the oracle also: and, in fact, the oracle would be shut, according to rule, from the month Ἀποτρόπιος in the Delphian calendar, (which B. C. 172, Period iii. 51, Cyc. vii. 3, of that calendar corresponded to September 8,) to the end of the Delphian year: and though it might have been open in the month before this, yet as there was only one day in every month on which it could be consulted, and that the 7th—which this year fell upon August 16—it is manifest that even if Eumenes had been at Delphi as early as August 16, instead of a month later, the Rhodians could not possibly have heard of what had happened to him there, when they were celebrating their Ἔλεια and excluding his Θεωρία from any participation in them.

There is also an allusion to the Ἔλεια in the Ῥοδιακός of the sophist Aristides<sup>3</sup>, which appears to have been written when he was in Egypt, and had just heard of the earthquake which had recently happened at Rhodes, and thrown down the greatest part of the city. Of the date of this incident, nothing is known for certain, except that it took place in the reign of Antoninus Pius, later than the third of his reign at least<sup>4</sup>. Nor can any thing be collected from these allusions to it concerning the circumstances under which it took place, except that it was at the hour of the ἄριστον (i. e. a little before noon) some day, and before the Ἔλεια had yet been celebrated—though they were close at hand<sup>5</sup>: Καὶ τὸν μὲν τῶν Ἄλιων ἀγῶνα ποιήσετε, καὶ τὸ χωρίον μεμένηκε σῶν οὐ ποιήσετε κ', τ. λ.

<sup>3</sup> Oratio xliii.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Capitolinus, Antoninus Pius, 9. 8: Pausanias, viii. xliii. 3. cf. ii. vii. 1: Aristides, xliii. i. 819. l. 5. cf. xlv. i. 824. 14: 834. 8: also our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels, iv. 588.

Corpus Inscript. iii. 321: the editor is of opinion that the λόγος Αἰγυπτιακός, delivered when Aristides was in

Egypt on this occasion, is to be dated A. D. 147 or 148.

Mr. Letronne (cf. ad iii. 327. 4679) supposes him to have been in Egypt A. D. 145-147. He was there three years, whensoever it was: and in the course of this time must the earthquake at Rhodes, which gave occasion to the λόγος Ῥοδιακός, also have happened.

<sup>5</sup> xliii. i. 805. 9: 808. 8.

tan, the Syracusan, the Geloan, the Agrigentine, the Tauromenian, and the Cyrenian calendars respectively; and will do so again in calendars which have not yet been particularly considered. In short, there is every reason to believe that as the Carnean observance was characteristic of the Greeks of Doric extraction everywhere, there was a Carnean month in every Doric calendar; a month devoted to the Carnean observance, and taking its name from its relation to it. And as the Rhodians also were of Doric extraction, and if the testimony of antiquity is to be believed, as proud and as tenacious of their Doric descent as any of the same family, it would be nothing improbable *a priori* that they would have a  $\text{Μῆν Καρνεῖος}$  in their calendar also, and no doubt a Carnean solemnity, to which it was devoted.

This fact is placed out of question by the testimony of these Figuline inscriptions. The observable circumstance is that as the Carnean institution, which gave its name to the Carnean month among the Dorians, was determined by circumstances in the first instance to the month of August, it was to be expected *a priori* that this Carnean month, as the regular representative of the original institution, in each of these calendars, would be found occupying a site corresponding to the Julian August or September. And this, as our scheme shews, was exactly the case with the Carneus of the Rhodian calendar; the limits of which in the first year of the cycle of Type i, were August 31 and September 29. The further explanation of the Carnean institution is reserved for the Dissertation in which we hope to treat of the Carnean Ennead.

Type i. x = Type ii. vi.  $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma = \text{Πνανεψιδών.}$

The name of this month also was not peculiar to the Rhodian calendar. The etymon of the name, wheresoever it occurs, is no doubt the same, either  $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota$  or  $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\alpha$ ; and its meaning in every instance either that of the month of the Thesmophori, or that of the month of the Thesmophoria. And though it is no necessary inference that, wheresoever the  $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\alpha$  were observed, there there was a month called  $\Theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in the calendar, the converse is very likely to have been true, that where there was a

month called Θεσμοφόριος in the calendar, there were Θεσμοφόρια also, celebrated in that month.

But with respect to the site of this month, and even as devoted to such rites and services in honour of the Θεσμοφόροι, we observed on a former occasion<sup>h</sup> that, though it might have been determined by circumstances in particular instances to a much earlier period of the summer, its natural season, and most in unison with the nature and final end of the institution itself, was seed-time properly so called; i. e. the month next after, not next before, the autumnal equinox. Such was the site of the Thesmophoria as transferred by Solon, B. C. 592, to the 14th of Pyanepsion; and such must have been the site of the Rhodian Thesmophorius, according to our scheme—the Julian limits of which in the first year of its proper cycle were Sept. 29 and Oct. 29.

Type i. xi. = Type ii. vii. Σμίνθιος = Μαιμακτηριών.

The etymon of this name, and the probable reason why it was given to this month, will appear from the following testimonies to one of the styles and titles of the Apollo of classical antiquity.

i. Σμινθεῦ<sup>i</sup>. Ἐπίθετον Ἀπόλλωνος. Σμίνθος γὰρ τόπος τῆς Τρωάδος, ἐν ᾧ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος Σμινθίου, ἀπὸ αἰτίας τῆσδε. ἐν Χρύσῃ πόλει τῆς Μυσίας Κρῖνις τις ἱερεὺς ἦν τοῦ κείθι Ἀπόλλωνος. τούτῳ ὀργισθεὶς ὁ θεὸς ἔπεμψεν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀγροῖς μύας, οἷτινες τοὺς καρποὺς ἐλυμαίνοντο. βουλευθεὶς δὲ ποτε ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ καταλαγῆναι ... τοξεύσας τοὺς μῦς διέφθειρεν ... οὐ γενομένου ὁ Κρῖνις ἱερὸν ἰδρύσατο τῷ θεῷ, Σμινθέα αὐτὸν προσαγορεύσας, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὴν ἐγχώριον αὐτῶν διάλεκτον οἱ μῦες σμίνθοι καλοῦνται—Ἄλλοι δὲ οὕτως· Ὅτι Κρήτες ἀποικίαν στέλλοντες χρησμόν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὅπου αὐτοῖς ἐναντιωθῶσι γηγενεῖς (ἔλεγε δὲ περὶ μύων) ἐκεῖ κτίσαι τὴν πόλιν. οἱ δὲ ἀπέστειλαν τοὺς ἀποίκους. ἐλθόντων δὲ εἰς τὸν Ἑλλάσποντον καὶ νυκτὸς ἐπιγενομένης, μῦες ἔκοψαν αὐτῶν τοὺς τελαμῶνας τῶν ὄπλων. πρῶτ' δὲ ἀναστάντες καὶ θεασάμενοι τούτο ... ἔκτισαν ἐκεῖ πόλιν, ἣν τινα ἐκάλεσαν Σμινθίαν· οἱ γὰρ Κρήτες τοὺς μύας σμίνθους καλοῦσιν. ἐκ τούτου καὶ Ἀπόλ-

<sup>h</sup> Vol. iv. 310. Dissertation ii.

<sup>i</sup> Scholia ad Iliad. A. 37—

Κλῦθί μιν, ἀργυρότοξ', ὃς Χρῦσῃν ἀμφιβέβηκας, κ', τ. λ.

Σμινθεῦ—



λων Σμίνθιος διὰ τὸ ὑπερασπίζειν αὐτῆς—Σμινθεῦ \*· Ἐπίθετον Ἀπόλλωνος κατὰ τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον, ἀπὸ πόλεως Τρωϊκῆς Σμίνθης καλουμένης. ὁ δὲ Ἀπίων ἀπὸ τῶν μυῶν οὐ Σμίνθιοι καλοῦνται. καὶ ἐν Ῥόδῳ Σμίνθια ἑορτῆ, ὅτι τῶν μυῶν ποτε λυμαινομένων τὸν καρπὸν τῶν ἀρπελώων Ἀπόλλων καὶ Διόνυσος διέφθειραν τοὺς μύας—Πολέμων δὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὴν Τρωάδα κατοικοῦντας ἱστορεῖ τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους μῦς, οὓς σμίνθους καλοῦσι, (σέβειν,) ὅτι τὰς νεύρας τῶν πολεμίων διέτρωγον τῶν τόξων. καὶ Σμίνθιον Ἀπόλλωνα ἀπὸ τῶν μυῶν ἐκείνων ἐπεφήμισαν<sup>1</sup>—Κρητῶν ἐπιστρατευσάντων τοῖς Τρώσι ... οἱ μῦς νύκτωρ ἐπιθέμενοι τοὺς τελαμῶνας τῶν ἀσπίδων αὐτῶν διέτρωγον. καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἰδρῦσαντο μὲν ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐπωνόμασαν δὲ αὐτὸ Σμίνθιον, Κρητῶν ἐπιχωρίῳ γλώττῃ· σμίνθους γὰρ τοὺς μύας οἱ Κρήτες καλοῦσι<sup>m</sup>.

ii. Σμίνθος· μῦς<sup>n</sup>. καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων δὲ Σμινθεὺς, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ μυωπίας, φασί, βεβηκέσαι—Σμίνθα· ὁ κατοικίδιος μῦς<sup>n</sup>—Σμινθεὺς· ὁ ἐν τῇ Σμίνθῃ τιμώμενος<sup>n</sup>—Σμινθεὺς· ἐπίθετον Ἀπόλλωνος. οὕτω καλοῦσι Κρήτες τοὺς μύας. ζῆτει τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐν τῷ ἁ τῆς Ἰλιάδος<sup>o</sup>—Σμίνθη· πόλις Τροίας· τὸ ἔθνικόν Σμινθαῖος καὶ Σμινθεὺς<sup>p</sup>—Ἔστι Σμινθεὺς Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπίθετον. καὶ οἱ μὲν φασιν ἀπὸ Σμίνθης πόλεως περὶ Τροίαν, ὡς καὶ ὁ τὰ ἔθνικὰ ἐπιτέμνων φησὶν· ἥσπερ ὁ πολίτης καὶ Σμινθαῖος λέγεται καὶ Σμινθεὺς· ὡς εἶναι οὕτω Σμινθέα τὸν ἐν τῇ πόλει Σμίνθῃ τιμώμενον. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν σμίνθων, ὁ δηλοῖ τοὺς μύας, αὐτὸν οὕτω καλεῖσθαι φασί. δοκεῖ γὰρ ποτε ἀναιρέτης γενέσθαι σμίνθων βλαπτόντων τοὺς ἐκεῖ, ὡς διὰ τοῦτο ναόν τε αὐτοῦ ἰδρυθῆναι, καὶ αὐτὸν Σμινθέα κληθῆναι διὰ τοὺς ἀποσοβηθέντας μύας, οὓς οἱ ἐγχώριοι σμίνθους ἐκάλου. φησὶ γὰρ ἡ ἱστορία ὅτι ἐν τῇ Χρῦση Σμινθέως ἐστὶν ἱερὸν, καὶ μῦς ὑπόκειται τῷ ποδὶ τοῦ ξοάνου, Σκόπα ἔργον τοῦ Παρίου κ', τ. λ. ἡ δὲ τοῦτο λέγουσα ἱστορία καὶ τοξευθῆναι ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος τοὺς μύας λέγει, καὶ τὸ λήϊον ἐκτίθεται τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνων βλαπτόμενοι, λέγουσα κ', τ. λ. διὸ καὶ Σμινθέως (ταῦτὸν δ' εἰπεῖν μυοκτόνου) Ἀπόλλωνος ἰδρῦσατο ἱερὸν ... ἀπὸ σμίνθων γὰρ, ὅπερ μῦες εἰσίν. οὕτω δὲ ἄξιος λόγου τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐδόκει ὁ περὶ τοῦ Σμινθέως Ἀπόλλωνος μῦθος, ὥστε καὶ λόγοι Σμινθιακοὶ ἐγράφοντο\*, καὶ μέθοδος ἦν εἰς

\* Cf. Menander Rhetor, (of Alexandria Troas,) Περὶ Σμινθιακῶν, iv. 17. apud Mr. Grote, History of Greece, i. 469, note.

<sup>k</sup> Apollonius, Lexicon Homericum.

<sup>l</sup> Clemens Alex. Protrepticon, ii.

§ 39. pag. 34. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. in loc. iv. 109.

<sup>n</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>o</sup> Etymologicum Magnum.

<sup>p</sup> Steph. Byz. cf. in Σμίνθιον.

τούτους ῥητορικῆ. οἱ δὲ τινες ἄλλην ἱστορίαν ἐκτίθενται περὶ τοῦ Σμινθέως κ', τ. λ. ὡς δὲ ὕπνος εἶχεν αὐτοὺς (τοὺς Κρήτας), ἐξέρπουσι γῆθεν μῦες οὓς αὐτοὶ σμίνθους ἐκάλουν κατὰ γλῶσσαν ἐγχώριον κ', τ. λ. καὶ πόλιν τοῖς σμίνθοις παρώνυμον κτίζουσι, καὶ Σμινθέα τιμῶσιν Ἀπόλλωνα, ἤγουν ὡς ἂν εἶποι τις διὰ σμίνθων χρῆσαντα ὄν καὶ ἰδρύνουσι μὺς ἐπιβεβηκότα, ὡσανεὶ πατάξαντα τὸ θηρίον κ', τ. λ. ὁ δὲ γεωγράφος λέγει καὶ ὅτι Ἰδιη τὸ Τρωϊκὸν ὄρος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ παρωνόμασται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ Κρήτης ἀφιγμένων Τεύκρων, οἷς ἐπέθεντο οἱ ἄρουραῖοι μῦες. Ἡρακλέων δὲ ὁ Ποντικὸς πληθύνοντάς φησι τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν μύας νομισθῆναι ἱεροῦς, καὶ τὸ ξόανον οὕτω κατασκευασθῆναι βεβηκὸς ἐπὶ τῷ μύϊ. διάφοροι δὲ, φησι, τόποι ἐν οἷς τὸ τοῦ Σμινθέως ὄνομα. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἔοικεν ὁ Σμινθεὺς καὶ Σμίνθιος λέγεσθαι, ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῶν Σμινθιακῶν λόγων. ὡς γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Σάμιος καὶ Ῥόδιος τὰ Σαμιακὰ καὶ τὰ Ῥοδιακὰ, οὕτω φαίνεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Σμίνθιος εἶναι τὰ Σμινθιακά ἧ.

- iii. Οὐδ' οἷγ' ἀπηρκέσθησαν ἀντ' ἕσων ἕσα  
λαβόντες, ἀλλὰ κλῶπα σὺν Τεύκρω στρατὸν  
καὶ σὺν Σκαμάνδρῳ Δραυκίῳ φυτοσπόρῳ  
εἰς Βεβρύκων ἕστειλαν οἰκητήριον,  
σμίνθοισι δηρίσοντας κ', τ. λ.<sup>1</sup>—

Teucus Rhœteas<sup>s</sup>: De hoc fabula duplex est .... alii, inter quos et Trogus, Scamandri filium tradunt. qui Scamander, cum Creta frugum inopia laboraret, cum parte tertia populi ad exteras sedes quærendas profectus est, ab Apolline monitus ibi cum habiturum sedes ubi noctu a terrigenis obpugnatus esset. cum ad Frigiam venisset et castra posuisset, noctu mures arcuum nervos et loramenta armorum adrosuerunt. Scamander hos interpretatus hostes esse terrigenas, in Idæ montis radicibus ædificia collocavit &c. filioque ejus Teucro regnum traditum, qui... et templum Apollini constituit, quem Sminthium appellavit. Cretenses cum murem Sminthicem dicunt. alii... Teucrum ipsum sub conditione supradicti oraculi profectum Creta dicunt... et Sminthos mures vocari a Frigibus.

iv. Καὶ οἱ τὴν Ἀμαξίτων δὲ τῆς Τρωάδος κατοικοῦντες μῦς σέβουσι. ἔνθεν τοι καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς τιμώμενον Σμίνθιον καλοῦσι, φασίν. ἔτι γὰρ καὶ τοὺς Αἰολέας καὶ τοὺς Τρώας

<sup>1</sup> Eustathius in Iliad. A. 39. 34. 11.      <sup>1</sup> Lycophron, 1302. cf. Tzetzes in loc.

<sup>s</sup> Servius, ad Æneid. iii. 108.

τὸν μῦν προσαγορεύειν Σμίνθιον. ὡσπεροῦν καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τῷ Σισύφῳ·

Ἄλλ' ἀρουραῖός τις ἐστι, Σμίνθιος\* ὡς ὑπερφύης.

καὶ τρέφονται μὲν ἐς τοὺς Σμινθίους μῦες τιθασσοί, δημοσίας τροφὰς λαμβάνοντες, ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ βωμῷ καὶ φωλεύουσι λευκοὶ, καὶ παρὰ τῷ τρίποδι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἔστηκε μῦς. μυθολόγημα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆσδε τῆς θρησκείας καὶ ἐκεῖνο προσακήκοα. τῶν Αἰολέων καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ λήϊα πολλὰς μυῶν μυριάδας ἐπελθούσας ἄωρους ὑποκείρειν . . . οὐκοῦν τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς θεὸν πυνθανόμενον (πυνθανομένους) εἰπεῖν Ὅτι δεῖ θύειν Ἀπόλλωνι Σμινθεῖ. τοὺς δὲ πεισθέντας ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ἐκ τῶν μυῶν ἐπιβουλῆς, καὶ τὸν πυρὸν αὐτοῖς ἐς τότε τὸν νεορομισμένον ἄμητον ἀφικνεῖσθαι. ἐπιλέγουσι δὲ ἄρα τούτοις καὶ ἐκεῖνα κ', τ. λ.<sup>t</sup> The story follows of the colony from Crete, the oracle, and the *γηγενεῖς*.

v. De Troade<sup>v</sup>: Ἐν δὲ τῇ Χρύσῃ ταύτῃ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Σμινθέως Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστιν ἱερόν· καὶ τὸ σύμβολον τὸ τὴν ἐτυμότητα τοῦ ὀνόματος σώζον, ὁ μῦς, ὑπόκειται τῷ ποδὶ τοῦ ξοάνου. Σκόπα δ' ἐστὶν ἔργα τοῦ Παρίου † κ', τ. λ. Ἡρακλείδης δ' ὁ Ποντικός κ', τ. λ.<sup>λ</sup> πολλαχοῦ δ' ἐστὶ τὸ τοῦ Σμινθέως ὄνομα. καὶ γὰρ περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀμαξιτὸν, χωρὶς τοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν Σμινθίου, δύο τόποι καλοῦνται Σμίνθια· καὶ ἄλλοι δ' ἐν τῇ πλησίον Λαρισσαίᾳ· καὶ ἐν τῇ Παριανῇ δ' ἐστὶ χωρίον τὰ Σμίνθια καλούμενον, καὶ ἐν Ῥόδῳ καὶ ἐν Λίνδῳ, καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πολλαχοῦ. καλοῦσι δὲ νῦν τὸ ἱερόν Σμίνθιον.

It is clear from these testimonies that though *Σμίνθη*, or *Σμίνθια*, was a name common to many places, and *Σμινθεὺς* or *Σμίνθιος* a common title of Apollo; all these names were ultimately derivable from the same etymon, the proper form of which was *Σμίνθος*. It is equally clear that this word in itself was a gloss on the more common one of *μῦς*; and, as it appears from the majority of these testimonies, a gloss of the

\* Corrige *Σμίνθος* ὦς.

† The story of the colony from Crete, and of the oracle, is subjoined here too; with this additional circumstance, that the authority for it was Callinus, the elegiac poet of Smyrna: which, if true, would trace it upwards to a very remote antiquity; this Callinus having been a contemporary of Gyges, the king of Lydia, and of the first Cimmerian invasion. Cf. Mr. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, i. ad ann. 736 and 712.

<sup>t</sup> *Ælianus*, De Natura Animalium, xii. 5.

<sup>v</sup> Strabo, xiii. 1. 117 b. 118 a. cf. 130, 131.    <sup>λ</sup> See supra from Eustathius.

dialect of Crete: though some of them represent it as the name for the mouse in the ancient Phrygian. But that may be accounted for by the fact which also appears from them, that even though peculiar originally to Crete, it must have been early transported to Phrygia or Troas by the colony from Crete, which settled there and founded the city of Σμίνθη. And from this time forward it might have become naturalized in the Phrygian language; even though it had not belonged to it before.

Thirdly, it is very important to observe that though μῦς, in Greek, was the generic name of that animal, and applicable to every species and variety of it alike, σμίνθος does not appear to have been so; but to have been restricted to one kind of the mouse, the μῦς ἀρουραῖος, or field mouse, in contradistinction to the μῦς κατοικίδιος, or domestic mouse. And though Hesychius explained the term as if synonymous with μῦς κατοικίδιος, it was only in reference to, and in connection with, the Sminthian Apollo, of which this kind of mouse was symbolical. For it appears from others of these testimonies, that this kind of mouse was sacred to him; that his image was represented with its foot on one of them, or on the burrow of a mouse of this kind; and that they were encouraged to run at large and to breed in his temple, and, in short, were the field mouse reclaimed and domesticated, in this particular instance, the better to illustrate and symbolize their relation to the Sminthian Apollo.

It follows however that if the Sminthian Apollo derived this name from the mouse, it must have been from the field mouse: and in order to explain the application of such a name to Apollo himself, that distinction is one of much importance. The domestic mouse, where it abounded in greater numbers than usual, might be a trouble, an inconvenience, a nuisance, in private, but it could not be a *public* calamity, a source of mischief and injury to society on a large scale; whereas the field-mouse, under similar circumstances, was liable to be a public misfortune, an evil and inconvenience, on so large a scale, and so serious in its consequences, that to interfere expressly for its removal might not be unworthy of the greatest of the gods of classical antiquity; and to give them

a title, expressive of an interposition of this kind, might be becoming the gratitude of their worshippers\*. And this distinction, respecting the etymon of the name of the Sminthian, as applied to Apollo, is just as important with respect to its meaning, as applied to the month. If Apollo was so called, because he was the destroyer of the field-mouse, the deliverer from the ravages of the field-mouse, the month must have been so called because it was the month of the field-mouse, the month in which the field-mouse was most apt to abound, to become a plague and a grievance, great enough to call for the interposition of the Sminthian Apollo himself.

Now Mr. Harmer<sup>y</sup>, speaking on this subject of the plague of the field-mouse and that of the locust, respectively, in the east, quotes the testimony of William, archbishop of Tyre, and of Fulcherius Carnotensis, in the *Gesta Dei per Francos* <sup>z</sup>, from their own experience of the matter of fact in Palestine at least (the opposite coast to Rhodes), that though this country

\* It appears from the context of some of the testimonies, *supra*, (that of Apollonius,) that this explanation of the title of Apollo Sminthius, which derived it from the field-mouse, in the opinion of Aristarchus, the celebrated commentator on Homer, was too low and mean for so dignified a subject. It is strange that so learned a man should have objected to the Apollo *Σμινθεύς* of his countrymen, if he did not do so to the Apollo *Πορροπίων*, or *Κορροπίων*. (see *supra*, vol. ii. 688.) or *ἐρυθίβιος*, or to the Hercules *μύαγρος*, or *ἰποκτόνος*, or to the *Ζεὺς ἀπόμνιος* of the Greeks also. Cf. Eustathius, ad *Iliad*. A. 39. i. 34. 11 sqq. Clemens Alex. *Protrepticon*, ii. § 38, 39, &c. Yet, that services of this kind might well be imputed to the gods, and acknowledged by appropriate titles, the reader may see by turning to the instances collected by Eustathius, ad *Iliad*. A. 39. p. 35. 1-33: of plagues of animals, some of the minutest kind, and even of insects, which had compelled whole nations to abandon their country, and seek an asylum elsewhere. The reader need not be reminded of the hornet, which drove out two of the nations of Canaan, before the *Eisodus*, nor of the Baalzebub, or Lord of the Fly, at Ekron, who derived that title from a well known scourge of cattle in the East. It is strange too that, whether worthy of Apollo or not, the derivation of this title of his, as matter of fact, from *σμίμβος*, the field-mouse, should ever have been doubted. The true etymon of the term, as Strabo observed, (illustrated by the figure of Apollo himself, standing on the hole of the field-mouse, or holding one in his hand,) appealed to the senses.

<sup>y</sup> Observations, edited by Dr. Adam Clark, iii. 397.

<sup>z</sup> Page 427.

was liable to each of these visitations, it was not at the same time of the year, nor in the same way. Both were *Pestes frugum*, the most formidable to the hopes of the husbandman, and the most calamitous to the promise of the year, of any which could befall it; but the plague of field-mice, when the corn was sprouting and issuing above ground: that of the locust, when it was now in the ear, and approaching to maturity.

It confirms the truth of this distinction, that if any cases of the plague of the field-mouse have been recorded in history, they are determinable by the circumstances of the occasion to that period of the natural year when the corn, having been already sown, was springing and growing up. Such, for example, is that instance of a visitation of this kind, of which we have the account in Scripture, as one of the other circumstances of the captivity of the ark, in the time of Samuel, and of its sojourn among the Philistines<sup>a</sup>; for that too is determinable to seed time in the natural year. Such also is the account, which the classical reader will remember to have been given by Herodotus<sup>b</sup>, of the deliverance of Sethon, the priest of the Egyptian Vulcan, (Hephæstus, or Phthas,) from a threatened invasion of the Assyrians, under Sennacherib, through the interposition of an army of field-mice—an incident to which we refer, not as to a matter of fact itself, but simply as the Egyptian version of the real miracle of Scripture, wrought for the deliverance of Hezekiah, from a similar danger, and from the same quarter—and as an illustration of the time of the year, at which the appearance of the field-mouse, in greater numbers than usual, would have been only agreeable to the course of nature. For the true time of the actual miracle of Scripture, as determined by circumstances before and after, was the latter end of the natural year, when the corn had been already sown, and must have been growing up. And that must consequently have been the time of the deliverance of Sethon, according to the Egyptian account, by the interposition of his Phthas; and therefore the time when the appearance of the field-mouse in such numbers, as raised up and directed by a divine

<sup>a</sup> i Samuel vi. 4, 5.

<sup>b</sup> ii. 141.

impulse, might have been the instrumental means of this deliverance.

We infer then that this eleventh month in the Rhodian calendar was called *Σμίνθιος*, because it was the month in which the field-mouse was liable to appear, if ever, to the injury of the springing corn. Consequently that its place in the natural year must have been next after the seed month; and that being the month next after the autumnal equinox, this would be the next but one. And this conclusion is entirely in unison with the place assigned it in our list, next after Thesmophorius; and with its Julian limits, October 29 to November 27—those of the springing month for any climate of Greece, and especially for that of Rhodes\*.

Type i. xii. = Type ii. viii. *Διόςθνος* = *Ποσειδεών*.

A Rhodian inscription is extant, to which we have once before adverted<sup>c</sup>; in which two of the months, *Διόςθνος* and *Ῥακίνθιος*, are mentioned by name. This we shall quote, as far as may be necessary for our present purpose, premising

\* It is no difficulty that a festival called *Σμίνθια*, and no doubt in honour of the Sminthian Apollo, was celebrated in this month. The name of the month was not derived from the festival, but the name of the festival from that of the month. Mr. Grote (loco citato of his history, i. 469 note) has the following quotation, in reference to these *Σμίνθια*, from Menander Rhetor, *Ἐπιδεικτικῶν* iv. 14: but whether at Rhodes, or at Alexandria Troas, is doubtful: "Ὡσπερ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα πολλακίς ἐδέχετο ἡ πόλις τοῖς Σμινθίοις, ἠνίκα ἐξῆν θεοῦς προφανῶς ἐπιδημεῖν, οὕτω καὶ σε ἡ πόλις νῦν προσδέχεται. Athenæus, iii. 6: x. 63: has two allusions to the Rhodian *Σμίνθια*, one from an author whom he calls *Φιλόμνηστος*, the other from one whom he styles *Φιλόδημος*; from the latter of which we collect that they were older at Rhodes than the time of Cleobulus of Lindus, and from the former that their stated time in the natural year was later than that when the fig usually came into season, i. e. than September or October.

To the other arguments of the derivation of this name from the mouse, in some sense or other, we may add this; viz. that in one of the Figuline inscriptions, above referred to, (No. 394,) the mouse appears as a device without the name of the month to accompany it; the reason of which most probably was that this mouse, being the field-mouse, (the Sminthus, properly so called,) was competent of itself to indicate the Sminthian month, and was probably in this instance intended of that month.

that its object appears to have been to acknowledge the liberality of one of the citizens of Rhodes, Dionysodorus of Alexandria, ἀρχεραμιστῆς of the club or college of the Haliadae, and Haliastæ, at Rhodes, on various occasions, both towards the members of his own society, and towards the Commune Rhodiorum; by decreeing him suitable honours, both while he was still alive, and also after his death.

Ἐπὶ ἱερέως Δαμαινέτου Διοσθύου δωδεκ(ά)τα<sup>d</sup>...καὶ τοὶ ἄρχοντες οἳ τε ἐν(ε)στακότες καὶ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀεὶ αἰρούμενοι...καὶ ἀναγο(ρ)εύηται ἡ στεφάνωσις αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς συνόδοις τῆ δεύτερον ἡμέρα, μετὰ τὰ ἱερά...καὶ ἀναγορεύσαντες τῆ δεύτερον ἡμέρα τῶν συνόδων, ἀποδόσθων, κα(ὶ τὸ) εὔρον (the produce of the sale) καταβαλέτω εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὁ ἐπιστάτας ἐν τῷ συλλόγῳ ἐν τῷ ἐχομένῳ μηνὶ τῶν συνόδων. It concludes: Ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ἀναγορέων...καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τάφων ἐμ μηνὶ Ὑακινθίῳ κ', τ. λ. καὶ τοὶ ἄρχοντες οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀεὶ αἰρούμενοι κ', τ. λ.—τὸ δὲ ἐξαιρούμενον αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ Ὑακινθίῳ κ', τ. λ.

The first observation which may be made on this inscription is, that it confirms the conclusion to which we have already come<sup>e</sup>, that the ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος, at Rhodes, was the ἱερεὺς, not the πρύτανις. The next is, that it is dated on the 12th of the month, no doubt as a stated day of assembly, the proper term for which at Rhodes, whether ἐκκλησία, as at Athens, or ἀλία, or ἀλίσμα, as among many of the Doric communities of the same kind, does not appear in this inscription. These stated meetings however seem to have been purposely fixed to the beginning of the different decads of the month. At Athens, the first was the 11th, at Rhodes it might be the 12th. Thirdly, from the allusion at the beginning, to the ἄρχοντες in office at the time, as well as to those who should be so at any future time, it seems most reasonable to infer that the year could not have begun in the month in which the inscription was dated, Diosthyus, though it might have ended in it. A similar allusion occurs at the end, in reference to something which was to be done in the month Ὑακινθίῳ: from which it must be inferred, in like manner, that if the official year at Rhodes was now divided into halves, Ὑακινθίῳ was either the first in the second half, or the next after it.

<sup>d</sup> No. 2525 b. Corp. Inscript. ii. 392 b. Rhodes.

<sup>e</sup> Supra, page 177.



Fourthly, it is to be observed, that this decree, which acknowledges the obligations of the Commune Rhodiorum to this Dionysodorus, is preceded by three other entries, on the same marble, A a, A b, B a—which record particular instances of the liberality of the same individual, to particular societies, corporations, or clubs, with which he appears to have been connected; the first, that of the *Διονυσιασταὶ* (a society in honour of Dionysos); the second, that of the *Πανιασταὶ* (a similar society in honour of Pan); the third, that of the *Ἀλιασταὶ* and *Ἀλιάδαι* (in honour of Ἄλιος or the sun). It appears from the first that the members of that society must have received their name from their relation to the *Διονύσια*, in the sense of the orgies of Dionysos, rather than in the sense of the scenic representations so called also; and that their rule was to meet, for the purpose for which they were associated, every three years, i. e. every two years complete: and that these meetings were called *σύνοδοι*, and lasted two days at least, because the honours decreed to Dionysodorus in the name of the society were to be proclaimed on these occasions on the second day of the meeting. These occasions were consequently the Dionysia of the Rhodian calendar; and their stated month, most probably the usual month of the Dionysia, the second in the calendar—Badromius; and the month next after them, also alluded to in the inscription, was the third in the Rhodian calendar—Theudæsius.

Fifthly, the proclaiming of the *στεφάνωσις* of Dionysodorus being enjoined both in the Dionysian month, and in the month Hyakinthius; we may conjecture the reason was, that these months were six months asunder, as Badromius and Hyakinthius are in our list: and the Rhodian year of office being divided into two halves of six months each, a different set of magistrates would be in office, in Badromius, when the proclamation was first to be made, and in Hyakinthius, when it was to be repeated.

Sixthly, it was enjoined that this proclamation after the death of Dionysodorus should take place *Ἐπὶ τῶν τάφων*. The rule of the ancient Greeks universally, except in some peculiar cases, was to bury the dead *Ἐξὼ τῶν πυλῶν*<sup>f</sup>; and at Rhodes in particular, as we learn from Aristides<sup>g</sup>, it was

<sup>f</sup> Aristides, xliiii. i. 807. 1-7.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. 806, 807.

usual to hold the courts of law, for the trial of criminal cases, "Ἐξω τῶν πυλῶν too: and he associates their *ἱερά* and their *τάφοι*, as equally sacred in the estimation of the Rhodians<sup>b</sup>. In the month Hyakinthius, consequently, when the "Αλεια, in the usual course of things, would be going on also, the concourse of people to this quarter would probably be the greatest of any in the year; and that might be the reason why the proclamation of the *στεφάνωσις* after the death was directed to be made in this month in particular.

Lastly, with regard to the name of the month *Διόςθνος*, we have found one in the calendar of Elis closely resembling it, but not actually the same—*Δυόσδνος*, but not *Διόςθνος*: and we have met with one in the calendar of Thera, which seems to have been absolutely identical with it<sup>i</sup>—*Διόςθνος* also. The Elean month will come under consideration hereafter: and we will assume for the present that its etymon was altogether different from that of the Rhodian month, however much it may appear to resemble it externally. And as to the etymon of this month, *Διόςθνος*, both in the calendar of Thera and in this of Rhodes, it could have been nothing but the genitive case of *Ζεὺς* with *θύος* in the sense of *θυσία*. Nor could the meaning of a name so compounded have been anything but the "Sacrifice of Zeus."

And here a rule of the Attic calendar comes in opportunely to reflect some light on this name in each of these other calendars. The year at Athens ended with a sacrifice, on the last day of the year itself, to Jupiter *Σωτήρ*<sup>k</sup>: and the same might have been the case at Thera and at Rhodes. And if so, it was competent to have given its name to the last month of the calendar, as the month of the last stated sacrifice, the last solemnity of a public kind, which closed both the civil and the liturgic year.

With respect to the intercalary rule of the Rhodian calendar; if the intercalary month was from the first a second Panamus instead of a second Diosthyus, it must certainly have differed from the rule of the Greek lunar calendar in general. Yet it may be observed that, next to the twelfth month, the most natural seat of the intercalary month would

<sup>h</sup> xliv. (i. 844. 2.)

<sup>i</sup> Supra, Vol. ii. 670.

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. i. page 103. Metonic Dates, lviii.

be after the sixth (the place which seems to have been actually assigned it in others of the lunar calendars of antiquity, if not in the Grecian, as we may see hereafter). And it should also be considered that, in the particular case of an insular community, if the beginning of the year had been determined by circumstances to the winter solstice, the question which they would have to decide would be, whether the additional month should be given to the half of the year between the winter solstice and midsummer, or to the half between midsummer and the middle of winter. And it is easy to see how both public and private reasons of convenience would conspire to decide that question. The intercalary month then might be purposely given by the Rhodians to the spring quarter of the natural year; and that being the case, when their official year was now divided into two halves, nominally of equal length, the first half in the intercalary years of the cycle would be a month longer than the second.

SECTION V.—*On the change in the beginning of the official year, and in the Cycle of the Calendar. at Rhodes, B. C. 382.*

It does not appear, from the history of the Lunar Corrections among the Greeks, B. C. 592 to B. C. 468, that the Octaëteric Type, adopted at first, in any of these instances was superseded by the Metonic, until it had run through the first of its proper periods at least; and instances are not wanting in which it was retained for two or three periods. If therefore the people of Rhodes, B. C. 542, along with so many of their contemporaries, adopted the third Type of this lunar octaëteric correction in general, it is not probable that they would make any change in their calendar before the expiration of the first 160 years, proper to this Type; B. C. 382.

The *συνοικισμὸς* of Rhodes, as we have seen, is to be dated B. C. 408 or 407; and it is agreed that the political importance of the island, its naval and commercial greatness, (such as it afterwards became,) are ultimately to be traced to that event. Before this time the Rhodians made no figure in contemporary history: from this time forward, and especially after B. C. 382. they begin to be noticed and heard of as a rising and influential community. By this year, B. C. 382,

they had already become aware of their own consequence, and of the elements of prosperity and aggrandisement which they possessed within themselves: and it appears to have been the general opinion of the ancients that, whatsoever the motive which suggested the idea of their own consolidation into one community, and whatsoever the views and prospects which the originators of such a measure proposed by it, the constitution of the island in common, as settled and defined at the same time, was distinguished by its wisdom and foresight; and the political conduct of the Rhodians ever after was skilfully adapted to the change of circumstances, and to the gradual enlargement of the power and influence of their own island.

It seldom happened in these times that such of the Greeks as changed the cycle of their old octaëteric calendar, after the lapse of one or more of its proper periods, did not at the same time, change the beginning of the year; and B. C. 382 being the end of the first, and the beginning of the second, period of the third Type, there is no doubt that both these questions would come before the Rhodians, and have to be decided, against the arrival of that year. We must therefore take into consideration the circumstances of their position, and the influence which they were likely to have in the determination of these two questions; that they were an insular community, just beginning to feel their own importance, just coming into notice, and aspiring at still further distinction, to which they could hope to attain only through their naval superiority, and their commercial enterprise and activity, directed by their own prudence and sagacity. It is self-evident that, to a young and rising naval power, no season of the natural year could appear less suitable for the beginning of their civil and official year than that to which the calendar had been attached at first, and to which it was still confined—the winter solstice, when the sea was necessarily shut; none so convenient, none so desirable, as some one or other of the times when it was again open, after the winter.

We say one or other of these times; because, as we have often had occasion to observe, there was one such time when the sea was considered to be open, viz. that of the *Ζεφύρου προῆ*. midway between the winter solstice and the vernal

equinox ; the first and the earliest of all -- and therefore not available for public purposes, only for private adventure and short voyages : another, forty or fifty days later, with the arrival of the vernal equinox, when the sea might be considered more properly open, yet still not without risk for naval and military armaments. And besides these two, there was a third, the natural signal of the arrival of which was the appearance of the Πλειάδες, rising before the sun in the morning twilight ; the interval between which phenomenon, and the vernal equinox, the observation of the Greeks, beginning with Hesiod, seems to have assumed for every latitude in Greece, at 40 or 50 days, and the phenomenon itself as the natural indicator of the end of the spring, and the beginning of the summer, according to their division of the year<sup>1</sup>. This is the time and occasion, which the ancients must be understood to mean, when they allude to the opening of the sea, *absolutely* ; that is, on a large scale, and for naval enterprise of every kind, both public and private : sufficiently later even than the vernal equinox, to render navigation secure from any but its ordinary dangers, yet not too far advanced into the summer, to interfere with the proper naval and military season.

Now whether the ancient Rhodians at the end of the first Period of their Octaëteric correction adopted the Metonic in its stead, and whether, along with the cycle of their correction, they changed the beginning of the year also, are questions of fact which can be decided only by testimony, or by circumstantial evidence, equivalent to testimony : and the most satisfactory tests and criteria, to which we could appeal at present for this decision, will be supplied by the chronology of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, as we hope to see by and by. But besides these, notices also are scattered here and there on the page of contemporary history, from B. C. 382 downwards, which contribute to throw light on the same questions ; and by leading to the inference that the beginning of the civil year at Rhodes, at these different times later than B. C. 382, was coinciding with the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, lead also to the conclusion that the head of the

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, Vol. i. 291 note.

calendar must some time before have been previously transferred from the winter solstice to the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή; and if so, in B. C. 382.

These notices therefore we shall proceed to collect, before we pass to any further proofs of the same kind. But preliminary even to the consideration of any of these, it is necessary to observe, that as there were two principal dates of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, that of Meton and Euctemon, May 6, and that of Eudoxus, May 15, though it is well known to astronomers that the dates of such phenomena, adapted to one parallel of latitude, could not be arbitrarily transferred to another; yet the date of Meton and Euctemon, if first and properly adapted to the parallel of Athens, would be almost equally well suited for that of Rhodes, which differed from it only by one degree and an half in defect\*: and still more the date of Eudoxus, if that was first and properly adapted to the latitude of Cuidos, only half a degree different from that of Rhodes. But it is not certain that the Parapegma of Eudoxus had yet been published by B. C. 382; whereas none was more generally known among the Greeks by that time, and none was held in greater estimation, than that of Meton and Euctemon, published in B. C. 432. And the Rhodians would have this further reason for giving the preference to their date; viz. that by raising the epoch of their cycle from January 7 to January 8, B. C. 382, and simply transferring the beginning of the year from the first of Agrianius to the first of Artamitius, they would attach it at once to the Metonic date of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, and the ἀρχὴ θέρους, (the epoch of all others most desirable for the civil and official year of an insular community,) May 6.

* The latitude of Athens (the Parthenon) is . .	37	58	8	N.
That of Rhodes (the Mole) . . . . .	36	26	53	N.
Difference . . . . .	1	31	15	

So that if May 6 was a correct representation of the date of the phenomenon, for the climate of Athens, B. C. 432, May 7 would be more correct for the same climate, B. C. 382, and May 6 for that of Rhodes. See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 69, note.

SECTION VI.—Confirmation of the change from B. C. 382 downwards, by historical proofs.

i. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 171.

The proper style of the chief civil magistrate at Rhodes was that of *Πρύταρις*. Such was his title, B. C. 172, as it appears from Livy<sup>m</sup>. Strabo, referring to the discovery of what was called the *ἀμπερίτις γῆ* (a bituminous substance, which mixed with oil was of use in destroying the *φθειρίσις* in the vine) at Rhodes, in the time of Posidonius, tells us, from him, it was made when he himself was serving the office of Prytanis; *Πρυτανεύοντος αὐτοῦ*<sup>n</sup>. Appian speaks of the principal civil office at Rhodes under that title still, B. C. 42<sup>o</sup>; and Plutarch, alluding to such dignities in his time, classes together the *Στρατηγία* at Athens, the *Βοιωταρχία* at Thebes, and the *Πρυτανεία* at Rhodes<sup>p</sup>. There is reason to believe that, though no more than one *Πρύταρις* is generally alluded to at a particular time, yet as there was more than one Archon at Athens, and more than one *Βεωτάρχης* at Thebes, so there were more than one Prytanis at Rhodes<sup>q</sup>; and it may be collected from Cicero<sup>r</sup> that, either in his time, or at the time to which that dialogue was accommodated (B. C. 129), these Prytanis at Rhodes were partly *De Plebe*, and partly *De Senatu*, and took it in turns, *Quibus mensibus populari munere fungerentur, quibus senatorio*: the meaning of which probably is either that first one and then the other were in office for a month at a time, or that one of these classes served for one half of the year, and the other for the other.

The style then of the principal civil magistrate at Rhodes for the time being being that of the *Πρύταρις*; a fact is mentioned by Polybius of the year B. C. 171, from which it may be inferred that the official year at Rhodes was then beginning at the *Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή*. The Roman commander of

<sup>m</sup> xlii. 45. (cf. 37-44: 28, 29. 36: 47-51.) Also Polybius, xxvii. 3. § 3: xxviii. 2. § 1.

<sup>n</sup> vii. 5. 106 b.

<sup>o</sup> De Bell. Civ. iv. 66. (71.)

<sup>p</sup> Republicæ Gerendæ Præcepta, xvii.

<sup>q</sup> Cf. Diodorus, xx. 88. of the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorketes:

Οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις.

<sup>r</sup> De Republica, iii. ad fin. (p. 101.)

the fleet stationed at Cephallenia, B. C. 171, was Caius Lucretius<sup>s</sup>: and Polybius speaks of his sending a letter from that quarter to Rhodes, which was received there when Stratocles, the Prytanis for the time being, was *Πρυτανεύων τὴν δευτέραν ἔκμηνον*<sup>t</sup>—that is, in the latter half of the official year for the time being. This testimony is decisive that the official year at Rhodes was now divided into two halves of six months each; and consequently that Stratocles, serving the office on this occasion all the latter half of the year, was just come into office. If the year at this time began in Artamitius, then, by our Rhodian Metonic calendar<sup>v</sup>, Period iii. 60, (an intercalary year,) the first of Artamitius would fall April 15, B. C. 171, and the first of Sminthius, the eighth month from Artamitius, November 8; not too late for the receipt of such a letter as was sent on this occasion from the Roman admiral, stationed at Cephallenia.

## ii. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 48.

The following fact is recorded by Cicero<sup>x</sup>, as something which happened at Dyrrhachium, U. C. 705, B. C. 48, just before the battle of Pharsalia. Quintus his brother is the speaker in this part of the dialogue: *At ex te ipso non commentitiam rem sed factam ejusdem generis audivi: C. Coponium ad te venisse Dyrrhachio, cum prætorio imperio classi Rhodiæ præesset .... eumque dixisse remigem quemdam e quinqueremi Rhodiorum vaticinatum, Madefactum iri minus xxx diebus Græciam sanguine .... paucis sane post diebus ex Pharsalica fuga venisse Labienum .... et naves subito perterriti metu conscendistis, et noctu ad oppidum respicientes flagrantés onerarias, quas incenderant milites quia sequi noluerant, videbatis: postremo a Rhodia classe deserti verum vatem fuisse sensitistis.*

Though Cicero was left at Dyrrhachium, (*δι' ἀρρωστίας* y,) when Pompey marched after Cæsar to Thessaly, Quintus his brother accompanied him. It appears this prediction was not delivered until the news had been received of Pompey's

<sup>s</sup> Livy, xlii. 31-35. 37.

<sup>t</sup> xxvii. 6. § 2: 10-13: 16. cf. 8.

§ 6. 13.

<sup>v</sup> See Table i. vol. vi. Appendix.

<sup>x</sup> De Divinatione, i. 32, 68. cf. the Auctor De Bello Africano, 19.

<sup>y</sup> Plutarch, Vita, xxxix.



arrival in presence of Cæsar<sup>z</sup>: *Castra enim in Thessalia castris collata audiebamus*: and that could not have been until two or three weeks at least after the departure from Dyrrhachium, the date of which was early in May<sup>a</sup>. If Labienus arrived at Dyrrhachium a few days only after its delivery<sup>b</sup>; it must have been delivered just before the battle of Pharsalia, the date of which was June 5<sup>a</sup>. The Rhodian calendar in the year of Pharsalia, Period v. 31, would bear date May 4, Exemptile 15, and the second month, June 2, only three days before Pharsalia. And this being a full month, of 30 days complete, it is far from improbable that the prediction in question was delivered on the first of this month—and the *προθεσμία*, fixed for its fulfilment, was purposely limited to these thirty days. If so, it is an argument of the year of the Period and of the Cycle, which coincided with the year of Pharsalia, B. C. 48; viz. Period v. 31, Cycle ii. 12—but only as regularly derivable from the epoch of B. C. 382, Period i. 1, Cycle i. 1.

### iii. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 43.

In Cicero's letters, ad Familiares, there are two<sup>c</sup>, both of which were written in the consular year of Hirtius and Pansa, U. C. 711, B. C. 43, and both by Publius Lentulus\*; the first from Perga in Pamphylia, addressed to Cicero, and dated iv Kal. Junias; the second to the magistrates and those in authority at Rome, from the same quarter, but

\* This Lentulus was Publius Lentulus, son of P. Lentulus, consul U. C. 697, B. C. 57, in the year of Cicero's return from exile, (cf. our *Origg. Kal. Italicæ*, iii. 384 sqq.,) and one of his most intimate friends: cf. *Oratio xxxii. Pro P. Sextio*, 69, 144, from which it appears he received the *Toga Virilis*, the year before the accusation of Sextius, that is, B. C. 57, and some sacerdotium, conferred by the votes of the people, which entitled him to wear the *Toga Prætexta* also. He was a different person from L. Lentulus, consul U. C. 705, B. C. 49, the year before Pharsalia, and put to death in Egypt the same year as Pompey, but after him: see *Lucan, Pharsalia*, vii. 217: viii. 328: *Cæsar, De Bello Civ.* iii. 103, 104: *Valerius Maximus*, i. viii. *De Miraculis* 9: *Plutarch, Pompeius*, lxxx.: and our *Origg. Kal. Italicæ*, iii. 494 note. Of P. Lentulus the father, and this P. Lentulus the son, after Pharsalia, see ad *Atticum*, xi. 13.

<sup>z</sup> *De Divin.* ii. 55. 114.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. *Frontinus*, ii. vii. 13.

<sup>a</sup> Cf. our *Origines Kalendarie Italicæ*, iii. 469-474-480.

<sup>c</sup> xii. 14, 15.

dated iv Non. Junias. Lentulus had been sent to take the command of the fleet, and to cooperate with Cassius; who also had been sent to supersede Dolabella in Syria.

In the second of these epistles<sup>d</sup>, Lentulus complains that though the Rhodians had bound themselves by treaty, M. Marcello Ser. Sulpicio cons. (U. C. 703, B. C. 51), Eosdem hostes se habituros quos S. P. Q. R.—yet they had just shut him out from their ports. In his letter to Cicero<sup>e</sup>, he observes, Sed iidem illi qui tum fugientem patrem meum (after Pharsalia<sup>f</sup>), qui L. Lentulum qui Pompeium qui ceteros viros clarissimos non receperunt, iidem tamquam aliquo fato et nunc aut magistratum gerunt, aut eos qui sunt in magistratu in sua habent potestate. In his official letter he expresses himself as follows: Qua mente etiam ante nostrum adventum post Trebonii indignissimam cædem ... binæ profectæ erant ad Dolabellam legationes eorum, et quidem novo exemplo, contra leges ipsorum, prohibentibus iis qui tum magistratum gerebant: He adds, Hæc...sive potentia paucorum, qui et antea pari contumelia viros clarissimos (Pompey, Lentulus &c.) affecerant, et nunc maximos magistratus gerentes...mederi cum facile possent, noluerunt. nonnullis etiam ipsi magistratus veniebant in suspicionem detinuisse nos et demorati esse, dum classis Dolabellæ certior fieret de adventu nostro.

It is evident from the collation of these passages, that different magistrates were in office at the time of the arrival of Dolabella and of the death of Trebonius, and when these letters were written. Consequently that the official year at Rhodes must have begun between. The date of one of these letters was the 29th May Roman, and that of the other June 2 Roman. The year being B. C. 43, it corresponded to Period v. 36, in the Rhodian calendar, which entered on May 8. Dolabella came into Asia first, as we shewed on a former occasion<sup>g</sup>, towards the end of B. C. 44, and Trebonius was put to death by him at Smyrna, either at the very end of December Roman, or the very beginning of January Roman, next ensuing: time enough for the news of both these events to have reached Rhodes, (so near to Smyrna,) and to have

<sup>d</sup> Ad Fam. xii. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 14.

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Cæsar, De Bello Civili, iii. 102.

<sup>g</sup> Supra, Vol. iii. 360 sqq.

given occasion to two embassies to him from Rhodes, from some of its citizens there, whether with or without the consent of the magistrates for the year then current, before May 8. And the magistrates being liable to be changed on this very day, May 8, some of these very parties might actually be themselves in office, as the letter of Lentulus insinuates they were, when that was written, May 29 Roman, May 27 or 28 Julian. 19 or 20 days later than the ingress of the new year, and the change of magistrates. And this would be abundantly sufficient to account for his own exclusion from the port of Rhodes, as due to the influence of those who were then in office\*.

#### iv. Beginning of the official year, B. C. 42.

It appears from Appian<sup>h</sup>, that the Rhodians had elected a fresh Prytanis, (*Ἡπερ ἐστὶν*, says he, *ἀρχὴ παρ' αὐτοῖς μάλιστα ἀντοκράτωρ*,) just before the siege of Rhodes by Cassius this year. It follows that the Rhodian comitia this year must have preceded the siege; but not long. The siege itself was soon over<sup>i</sup>. The city was taken on the second day: and Cassius proceeded directly after to join Brutus at Abydos<sup>k</sup>.

When Cassius was besieging Rhodes, Brutus was laying siege to Xanthus in Lycia<sup>l</sup>: and it appears from Dio<sup>m</sup>, that when both arrived at Philippi at last, they found Norbanus and Decidius Saxa already there, though they had been sent from Italy by Antony and Cæsar only after the news had reached them of the siege of Rhodes, and of the operations of Brutus against the Lycians. It may be collected from Dio<sup>n</sup>, that Antony and Cæsar were still at Rome as late as

\* It appears from Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xiv. xi. 5, 6: *De Bello*, i. xi. 6, 7, that before the reduction of Laodicea in Syria, where Dolabella took refuge, and where he was besieged by Cassius, this year also, B. C. 43, but before the siege of Rhodes, one of the Jewish feasts was in course. Consequently either the Passover, March 23, or Pentecost, May 13: cf. *Ant. Jud.* xiv. xi. 6: *De Bello*, i. xi. 7: xii. 1. It was no doubt the latter. Laodicea had not yet been reduced by the date of Lentulus' letter, May 27, much less by May 13.

<sup>h</sup> *De Bell. Civ.* iv. 66. 71.

<sup>i</sup> Appian, *De Bell. Civ.* iv. 71-73, 74. cf. Joseph. *Bell.* i. xiv. 3.

<sup>k</sup> App. *B. C.* iv. 82. 87. cf. Val. Max. i. v. 8. *De Ominibus*.

<sup>l</sup> App. *B. C.* iv. 65. 75, 76-84. cf. Dio, xlvii. 33, 34.

<sup>m</sup> xlvii. 35, 36: App. *B. C.* iv. 87.

<sup>n</sup> Dio, xlvii. 18.

the Ludi Apollinares, July 12 Roman; and consequently, as they set out at last only after the receipt of the news of the reduction of Rhodes<sup>o</sup>, it is clear that this news was not received before July 12. We considered the dates of the battles of Philippi on a former occasion<sup>p</sup>; and saw reason to determine the first (in which Cassius lost his life) to the new moon of September, Sept. 20. On this principle, it required two months at least to march from Rome to Philippi; and if Norbanus and Saxa had been sent about a month before the departure of Antony and Cæsar also, they must have been sent about the middle of June. And if they were sent in consequence of the news which had just been received at Rome, of the danger threatening Rhodes from Cassius, and Xanthus from Brutus, we shewed in our Dissertations on the Arrangement and Principles of an Harmony of the Gospels<sup>q</sup>, by the production of a multitude of examples of the fact, that it would require an interval of four or five weeks, even in the summer time, to bring this news from Rhodes to Rome. If the news then reached Rome about the beginning of June, B. C. 42, it must have been sent about the end of April previously; and this was precisely the time when the new year at Rhodes, Period v. 37, April 27, B. C. 42, would be beginning, just before which, and the arrival of Cassius, they had elected their new magistrates, in the last month no doubt of the preceding year, March 28—April 27.

SECTION VII.—*On the Julian Calendar of Rhodes.*

The Metonic Correction then having been adopted by the Rhodians B. C. 382, and the head of their calendar attached at that time to May 6, the first Callippic Period of the correction would expire B. C. 306; and the principle of the Callippic correction having become generally known, B. C. 330, there is no reason why we may not assume that it would be applied to the Metonic calendar of the Rhodians at the end of its first period of 76 years, B. C. 306, and at the end of every similar period, later than the first, in its turn.

<sup>o</sup> Dio, xlvii. 35, 36.

<sup>p</sup> Supra, Vol. i. 114 sqq.

<sup>q</sup> Vol. iii. Append. Diss. viii. 380

sqq.

Now this year, as we have seen<sup>r</sup>, was the date of the Macedo-Hellenic calendar, or Calendar *κατὰ Ἑλληνίας*, Dius I, October 1, B. C. 306: and the Rhodian Thesmophorius the same year, the sixth month in their calendar, reckoned from Artamitius as the first, bearing date on October 1 also, it follows that just at this time (the first year of the first Callippic Period of the former of these calendars, and the first year of the second of the latter) there was no difference between Dius in the Macedo-Hellenic and Thesmophorius in the Rhodian; nor consequently between Γορπῖεος in the former and Hyakinthius in the latter, nor, in short, between any month in the former and the corresponding one in the latter. And if there was no difference at this time (in the first year of the proper Metonic Cycle, and the first year of the proper Callippic Period, of each), there could be none in any subsequent year, except *per accidens* and *pro tempore*: i. e. as often as the intercalary rule of either interfered for a time with their agreement.

It follows that from this point of time a given date in the Rhodian calendar might be transferred to the Macedo-Hellenic without any change except in the name of the month; a given date in Hyakinthius, for instance, to the same day in Γορπῖεος. Now a date so transferred is actually in existence, in the scholia on the viith Olympic ode of Pindars: and a date of no less importance in its own calendar than that of the principal festival in the Rhodian calendar itself, their Ἄλεια and their Τληπολέμεια: Τελεῖται γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἀγὼν Τληπολέμειος ἐπικαλούμενος. ἐγκωμιστικῶς δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος τὸν ἀγῶνα Ἰλιῶ τελούμενον εἰς τὸν Τληπόλεμον μετήγαγε. τελεῖται δὲ μηνὸς Γορπιαίου εἰκοστῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀπέχει δὲ τῶν Νεμέων ἡμέραις ἕξ· ἀγωνίζονται δὲ παῖδες καὶ ἄνδρες· ὁ δὲ στέφανος λεύκη δίδοται.

It makes no difference to the origin of this date, whether, as here stated, it is to be understood of the 24th of the lunar, or of the 24th of the solar, Γορπῖεος. In either case it must have been derived from the 24th of the Rhodian Hyakinthius, and merely substituted for it. But with respect to the question whether this Macedo-Hellenic date of the scholiast on Pindar is to be understood of the 24th of the solar, or the

<sup>r</sup> Vol. iii. 194 sqq.<sup>s</sup> Ad vers. 147.

24th of the lunar, month, the lunar calendar was much older everywhere among the Greeks than the solar in the sense of the Julian; and all such dates as these, which are extant at present, in terms of the solar calendar of after-times, must be considered to represent dates of the same denomination in the lunar of former times. These scholia on Pindar, as they have come down to us, are a very miscellaneous compilation; put together, no doubt, long after the transition of the last of the lunar calendars of the Greeks into the solar or Julian: but as distinguishable into two classes—the *Vetera* and the *Recentiora*—many of them no doubt, especially of the former, are the notes and observations of commentators, who wrote when the calendar of the Greeks was still everywhere lunar. Such appears to be the predominant character of the scholia, attributed to the *Vetus Scholiasta*, on this viiith Olympic ode. They belong to the æra of the still-continuing lunar calendar of the Greeks. It may most probably therefore be assumed that this date of the Rhodian Haleia and Tlepolemeia, which occurs in them, is the old lunar date of that kind; simply transferred from its own calendar to the Macedo-Hellenic, as the same with it, in other respects, and as the more likely of the two to be generally understood. On this principle, there was no difference between the 24th of the Macedo-Hellenic month and the 24th of the corresponding Rhodian one, while both these calendars were still lunar; and consequently there could have been no difference in the cycle and the period of each.

Another date however has also been handed down in terms of the Rhodian calendar, concerning the nature of which, whether a solar or a lunar one of its kind, there is less reason for doubt. Porphyry, *Περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψύχων*, speaking of the prevalence of human sacrifices anciently in various quarters, instances in one among the Greeks also, at Rhodes, and on a certain day in the Rhodian calendar<sup>†</sup>: Ἐθύετο γὰρ καὶ ἐν Ῥόδῳ μηνὶ Μεταγειτωνῶν ἕκτη ἰσταμένου ἀνθρώπος τῷ Κρόνῳ· ὃ δὴ ἐπιπολὺ κρατῆσαν ἕθος μετεβλήθη. Ἔνα γὰρ τῶν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δημοσίᾳ κατακριθέντων μέχρι μὲν τῶν Κρονίων συνείχον· ἐνστάσης δὲ τῆς

<sup>†</sup> Lib. ii. 54–56. pag. 197–201. cf. Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* iv. xv. xvi. 155 B: Cyrill. *contra Julianum*, iv.

128 A. 129 B: Theodoret, *Græcorum Affectuum Curatio*, vii. 294. § 41.

ἑορτῆς προαγαγόντες τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔξω πυλῶν ἀντικρυς τοῦ Ἀριστοβούλης (a title of Artemis) ἔδους οἴρου ποτίσαντες ἔσφαττον<sup>v</sup>.

We may observe on this account that, short as it is, the circumstance last mentioned, the sacrifice of this victim only ἔξω πυλῶν, is an internal evidence of its truth; for the man was a malefactor, already tried and condemned to death: and we were told by Aristides<sup>x</sup> that the Rhodians did not allow criminals to be tried, much less to be executed, ἔσω πυλῶν. In the next place, though the stated month of this sacrifice is here called Μεταγειτιῶν, there is no reason to suppose it is meant of the Attic month so styled. Μεταγειτιῶν was the common form of what at Rhodes was called Πεδαγείτνυος—just as Βοηδρομιῶν was of Βαδρόμιος. It is not to be supposed that, in a case like this, the stated date of so remarkable and peculiar a ceremony would be assigned in terms of any calendar but its own. We may take it for granted therefore that the 6th of Metageitnion here is to be understood of the 6th of Pedageitnyus.

Thirdly, this sacrifice was doubtless an annual one. Had it been otherwise, had it been usual to offer such a sacrifice only every two, or three, or four years, Porphyry would not have omitted so material a circumstance. But if it was an annual sacrifice; then, if this victim, after being designated for such a sacrifice, was kept a certain length of time, and offered at last in Pedageitnyus, Pedageitnyus could not have been the *first* month in the Rhodian calendar: and according to our list *supra* it was the seventh in Type i., and the third in Type ii.

Fourthly, with regard to the occasion at which this kind of sacrifice took place, it is represented simply as the Κρόνια. A ceremony or observance of this name, as we have seen<sup>v</sup>, entered many of the Greek lunar calendars, especially those of the fourth and fifth types of the octaëteric correction in general: but these Rhodian Cronia could not have been the same with those, because *they* appear to have been determined to the same time and season in their respective calendars as the Saturnalia in the Roman; but these Rhodian Cronia, if

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Eusebius, Præp. Evang. iv. xvii. 160 D.

<sup>x</sup> *Supra*, 217, 218.

<sup>y</sup> Vol. ii. 507 sqq.

they fell out in Pedageitnyus, must have fallen out at mid-summer. There was an observance so called in the Attic calendar also; to which these Rhodian Cronia must have approximated more nearly, because their date was the 6th of Pedageitnyus, and that of the Attic the 12th of Hecatombæon; and Pedageitnyus and Hecatombæon, *mutatis mutandis*, were the same.

But, to arrive at a true idea both of the nature and of the date of these Rhodian Cronia, we must go back to the first institution of the feast so called (the *ἱερὰ Κρόνου*, rites or ceremonies of Cronos,) among the Greeks anywhere. And the original Cronia of this kind, as we have often had occasion to explain, were the original Olympia, designed and instituted by Pelops in honour of Cronos, not of Zeus: and their original date was the epagomenæ of the Julian calendar, which he instituted at the same time for their regulation. To these six epagomenæ, as so intended and so devoted, he appears to have given the name of the *Μῆν Κρόνιος*—the month of the Cronia; the principal term of all being the last, the sixth; the day of the conclusion of the games, by the adjudication of the prizes, and by the sacrifice to Cronos, which consummated the celebrity. The stated epoch of his *Mensis Cronius* being June 25, that of the last day was June 30; and this being assumed as the day intended by Porphyry, or the date of the Cronia at Rhodes—the 6th of Metageitnion, on that principle, coincided with June 30, and therefore the first with June 25\*.

\* With respect to the practice of human sacrifices among the Greeks of antiquity, though history is silent about it, except in one or two cases, yet to judge from the facts collected in this chapter of Porphyry's, it must once have prevailed among them to a great extent. As to this particular instance of it in the island of Rhodes; the origin of such a custom there is most probably to be traced to Phœnicia. The Phœnicians were early distinguished by the spirit of maritime enterprise; and appear to have very early planted colonies in the islands of the Mediterranean as well as on the coasts of the opposite continent. It is known that they settled in Cyprus; and the same fact is asserted of the island of Rhodes: *Τὴν δὲ Ῥόδον τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον λαὸς αὐτόχθων ἐνέμοντο ὧν ἦρχε τὸ Ἡλιαδῶν γένος, οὗς Φοίνικες ἀνέστησαν καὶ τὴν νῆσον ἔσχον. Φοινίκων δ' ἐκπεσόντων Κἄρες ἔσχον, ὅτε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας νήσους τὰς περὶ τὸ Διγαῖον ᾤκησαν' οἷς ἐπιπλεύσαντες οἱ Δωριεῖς, πολέμῳ τὸ Καρικὸν καταστρεψάμενοι, τρεῖς πόλεις ἔκτισαν*



We may infer then from this testimony that the Rhodian calendar in the time of Porphyry was Julian; and the 6th of Metageitnion being a fixed Julian term therein, the 30th of June, the 1st of Metageitnion was a fixed Julian term, June 25. And the first of Metageitnion falling on June 25, the 1st of Hyakinthius very probably fell on July 25. And that being the stated date of the 1st of Gorpiaeus in the Macedo-Hellenic Julian calendar, the 24th of the former and the 24th of the latter must have been absolutely the same in the Julian calendar of each respectively, as they had before been in the lunar. The analogy of Metageitnion 1, as bearing date June 25 at this time, may vouch in like manner for Panamus 1 as attached to May 25, and for Artamitius 1 as the same with April 25, and so on, all round both the Rhodian and the Julian calendar. And this being supposed the ultimate state of the old lunar Rhodian calendar, after it passed into the Julian; nothing would seem to be necessary in order to complete its history, except to assign, if possible, the time when, and the circumstances under which, it probably passed into the Julian.

Now with respect to these circumstances; if the old lunar calendar was to undergo this change without any abrupt and violent transition, the inspection of the Type of the Metonic correction of the Rhodians will shew that the only year of its proper Period, suitable for that purpose, must have been the second, in which the regular lunar epoch of the year also was April 25. And the years, which would answer to this

Αἰνδὸν Ἰήλυσον καὶ Κάμειρον<sup>1</sup>. And though this author supposes these Phœnicians to have been expelled from the island by the Carians<sup>2</sup>, yet Diodorus<sup>3</sup> gives us to understand that at Ialysus in particular they were continuing to live on equal terms with the Dorians themselves; and the hereditary priests of Posidon there were of Phœnician extraction. Now human sacrifices from a very remote period were characteristic of the Phœnicians; and sacrifices to Cronos too<sup>4</sup>, as this sacrifice at Rhodes was: and the stated time of these sacrifices among the Phœnicians appears to have been the end or the beginning of the year: and that too must have been the case with this Rhodian sacrifice at the Cronia—at its first institution.

1 Photii Bibl. Codex 186. pag. 140. 42-141. 27. Conon, *Διηγήσεις*, xlvii.

2 Cf. Athen. iv. 71.

3 v. 58. cf. Athen. viii. 61.

4 See supra, Vol. iv. 355 n.

description, later than the date of the Julian correction at Rome, would be Period vi. 2, B. C. 1; Period vii. 2, A. D. 76; Period viii. 2, A. D. 152: lower than which it is perhaps unnecessary to go in search of them.

The first of these, B. C. 1, may be set aside as probably too early; though instances are not wanting of the adoption of the Julian correction among the Greeks, even in that year itself<sup>z</sup>. With respect to the other two; it is a question of some importance, preliminary to any decision between them, whether Rhodes, when it made this change in the style of its calendar, is to be supposed to have been still in possession of its *αὐτονομία*, or not so? Now it is agreed that it was deprived of its independence by Claudius, U. C. 797, A. D. 44<sup>a</sup>; and recovered it again U. C. 806, A. D. 53, chiefly out of compliment to Nero, who had himself pleaded its cause before the emperor<sup>b</sup>; on which occasion the following classical epigram was written by Antiphilus of Byzantium<sup>c</sup>:

Ὡς πάρος Ἀελίου νῦν Καίσαρος ἢ Ῥόδος εἰμὶ  
 νᾶσος, ἴσον δ' αὐχῶ φέγγος ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων.  
 ἦδη σβεννυμένην με νέα κατεφώτισεν ἀκτῖς,  
 Ἄλεια, καὶ παρὰ σὸν φέγγος ἔλαμψε Νέρων.  
 πῶς εἶπω τίνι μᾶλλον ὀφείλομαι; ὅς μὲν ἔδειξεν  
 ἐξ ἀλός, ὅς δ' ἦδη ῥύσατο δυομέναν.

And it seems to have continued in the enjoyment of the privilege thus restored down to the time of Vespasian; by whom this distinction was abolished in various instances, including that of Rhodes<sup>d</sup>: Achajam Lyciam Rhodum Byzantium Samum libertate adempta, item, Thraciam Ciliciam et Comagenem, ditionis regiæ usque ad id tempus, in provinciarum formam redegit: and at this time too, according to the Breviarium of Sextus Rufus, one province was constituted, comprising the islands: Rhodus et insulæ primum libere agebant, postea in consuetudinem parendi, Romanis clementer provocantibus, pervenerunt, et sub Vespasiano insularum provincia facta est. It is clear from the context of Suetonius<sup>e</sup>, that these acts of Vespasian, and other regula-

<sup>z</sup> See our Orig. Kal. Ital. iv. 100.  
 Diss. xx. ch. i. sect. 7.

<sup>a</sup> Dio, ix. 23, 24.

<sup>b</sup> Tacitus, Ann. xii. 58: Suetonius, Claudius, xxv: Nero, vii. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Anthologia, ii. 159: Antiphili xix.

<sup>d</sup> Suetonius, Vita, viii. 9

<sup>e</sup> Vita, viii. 2: Suscepit et censuram, &c.

tions of his of a kindred nature, must have begun to bear date from the assumption of the censorship, U. C. 825, A. D. 72, down to U. C. 827, A. D. 74, when the Lustrum conditum of that cycle was celebrated <sup>f</sup>. The cycle distinguished by these changes was consequently the 126th, A. D. 71–75; and that, in which they would probably come into stated and regular operation, would be the 127th, A. D. 76. We conjecture therefore that this was the year in which the Julian calendar was actually adopted at Rhodes, so that Artamitius from that time forward should bear date on April 25, Panamus on May 25, Metageitnion or Pedageitnyus on June 25, Hyakinthius on July 25, and so forth, in a manner analogous to the Macedo-Hellenic Julian calendar also throughout. But whether Artamitius continued to be the first month in this Julian calendar, as it had been in the Metonic until then, we cannot undertake to say.

---

## CHAPTER II.

*On the Cyclico-Julian Correction of the island of Rhodes; and on the Julian date of the Rhodian "Αλεια and Τληπολέμεια.*

---

SECTION I.—*On the opinions and the institutions connected with the Cyclico-Julian Corrections of antiquity.*

We have now traced the Primitive equable calendar among the ancient Rhodians, to the first of the lunar corrections derived from it, the Third Type of the Hellenic Octaëteris, B. C. 542; and from that to the Metonic correction of this Type, B. C. 382; and lastly from its proper Metonic correction, B. C. 382, to its proper Julian one, A. D. 76. To complete its history it remains to inquire whether there was ever an earlier correction of it, peculiar to the island of Rhodes; and if there was, of what kind, and when made? No testimony indeed is extant to which we could appeal directly in answer to this question; and though reasons and arguments *a priori* can never be decisive on questions of

<sup>f</sup> See our Orig. Kal. Ital. ii. 292. 338.

fact—still there are some considerations which may render it probable that the island of Rhodes would have a correction of the Primitive solar calendar, much older than the Lunar correction of B. C. 542; and there are certain matters of fact from which it may even be inferred that it must have had. These we shall proceed to lay before the reader; leaving him to judge for himself of the degree of deference which is due to them.

i. It has been already ascertained that there was one cyclico-Julian correction in the island of Crete, as old as B. C. 1301, and we hope to shew hereafter that there was another of exactly the same antiquity in the island of Cyprus; and both these islands were so near to that of Rhodes that it may well be considered probable their example would influence their neighbours and contemporaries, the Rhodians, to adopt the same kind of correction also, if not as early as B. C. 1301, yet at the beginning of the next cyclico-Julian period, proper to it, B. C. 1181.

ii. We have often had occasion to observe that these cyclico-Julian corrections were closely connected with the opinions and doctrines of antiquity, on an important and interesting point. They were associated with the cosmogonies of antiquity: they were signs and seals of the belief of the time concerning the origin of the existing system of things. They are seen to have been founded on certain preconceived notions, respecting the circumstances under which it came into being, and the powers, or agents, to the intervention of which that effect was due. And these in particular are observed to have been everywhere divisible into two great principles, an active and a passive, a masculine and a feminine; to the union of which, in the first instance, every form of life, from the lowest to the highest, was ultimately attributed. The Egyptians were the first who introduced such distinctions, and gave them the attributes and names of persons, calling one of them Osiris, and the other Isis. They were the first who ventured to define by a proper calendar date the epoch of the first actual exertion of the energies of these two principles, in their proper relation to each other, and to everything else; and the first who instituted significant rites and ceremonies, founded on these assumptions, and

intended to be a memorial of them perpetually. And these theories and these assumptions, thus received and established in Egypt, with the practical consequences to which they led, speedily passed to the rest of the ancient world, who did little more than accept them implicitly; merely changing the Egyptian names of the cosmogonic principles in question, and of their characteristic services, for others more proper to their own languages; and in particular retaining, with scrupulous fidelity to the original precedent of this kind, the month and the day of the month, consecrated in the first instance to such institutions and such services; which, having been the 17th of the primitive Athyr among the Egyptians, is seen to have been the 17th of the primitive Athyr in the majority of these instances everywhere else.

iii. It is observable, with respect to the antecedent state of things, up to the time when the present system was supposed to have come into being, that the tradition and belief of antiquity appear to have been everywhere the same, and everywhere in accordance with what may be collected from Scripture itself, just before the epoch of the Mosaic creation. This antecedent state of things is represented everywhere as that of a chaos; and this chaos simply what Scripture briefly but emphatically describes as the ante-Mosaic state of the present world—*darkness* and the *deep*, an *earth*, but without *form* and *void*. It was everywhere believed that darkness was prior to light, night was older than day—the confusion of chaos, than the order and harmony which the ancient Greeks expressed by their *Κόσμος*: and in particular that the first principle of things was water<sup>b</sup>; that chaos itself was only the universe of matter in a state of dissolution, and that all the actual forms of things came into existence out of the elements of this primeval mass, before indiscriminately mixed together.

It is therefore a good *a priori* argument of the probable existence of a cyclico-Julian correction in a particular instance, to find the assumptions and principles, which gave occasion to such corrections in general, in this particular

<sup>a</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 357.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 348 note.

instance also embodied in a definite form, and authenticated by local traditions of a corresponding nature. And this is eminently the case with the island of Rhodes, both as to the supposed origin of the island itself, and the circumstances under which it took place, and also to the powers or principles to whose particular cooperation the effect was attributed. The ancient Rhodians had *their* cosmogony, consistent not only with the testimony of Scripture respecting the origin of the world in general, but also with that modification of primitive tradition on this point, which was first introduced in Egypt, as specially applicable to the case of their own island. This we shall proceed to shew somewhat more particularly.

SECTION II.—*On the local tradition and belief concerning the origin of the island of Rhodes.*

In the first place, it may be collected from the testimony of antiquity, that this island was believed to have been in some manner or other the creature of the sea. Claræ jam pridem insulæ Delos et Rhodos, says Pliny<sup>i</sup>, memoriæ produntur enatæ—Ut in Asia Delos emersit, et Hiera et Anaphe, et Rhodus, Ophiusa et Pelagia prioribus seculis dictitata, aureo quondam imbri perfusa<sup>k</sup>. And that this did not mean simply that Rhodes was thought to have been a volcanic island, thrown up some time or other by an earthquake, appears from the viith Olympic ode of Pindar, one of the finest of that class of his odes; which though written nominally in honour of an individual citizen of Lindus, in Rhodes, is in reality a panegyric on the island in general, and embodies in a poetical form the local traditions of the Rhodians respecting their own origin: for which reason, as we are told by the Scholiast, it was considered worthy to be inscribed in letters of gold on the walls of the temple of the Lindian Athena, the oldest and most sacred in the island: Διαγόρα Ῥοδίῳ πύκτην νικήσαντι τὴν οἴ' Ὀλυμπιάδα ταύτην τὴν ᾠδὴν ἀνακεῖσθαί φησι Γόργων ἐν τῷ τῆς Λινδίας Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερῷ, χρυσοῖς γράμμασι. What then is the account of the origin of the island, which is given in this ode?

<sup>i</sup> H. N. ii. 89.

<sup>k</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, xvii. 7. 137.

Φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ  
 ῥήσιες, οὔπω ὅτε  
 χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεὺς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι  
 φανεράν ἐν πελάγει  
 Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ,  
 ἄλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι<sup>1</sup>.

That is. Rhodes was not yet visible when the gods were dividing the rest of the earth among them; but it was even then in existence, in the sense of growing up from the bottom of the sea.

Every one must perceive that this part of the traditionaly account of its origin must have been imagined κατ' οἰκονομίαν, in order to account for another circumstance in the same traditionaly history of the island from the first—its becoming the territory, the property, the *peculium*, of the sun, in contradistinction to any other part of the earth, from the first. For this purpose it was necessary to suppose *two* things; *one*, that the sun should be absent when the rest of the gods were dividing the surface of the earth among them, and consequently should have no part of it assigned to him along with them, by lot; the *other*, that Rhodes should not yet be visible, when this division of the rest of the surface of the earth was going on; and consequently should be assigned to none of the gods at that time, that so it might be assigned to the sun, *extra sortem*, afterwards.

And such was the actual tradition of the island in both respects, and such the supposed consequence of that state of the case, according to the ode of Pindar; which continues as follows.

Ἄπέοντος δ' οὔτις ἔν-  
 δειξεν λάχος Ἄελίου.  
 καὶ ῥά μιν χώρας ἀκλάρω-  
 τον λίπον ἄγνόν θεόν.  
 μνασθέντι δὲ Ζεὺς ἄμπαλον μέλ-  
 λεν θέμεν· ἀλλὰ μιν οὐκ  
 εἶασεν· ἐπεὶ πολιάς  
 εἶπέ τιν' αὐτὸς ὄρῳ ἐνδὸν θαλάσσης  
 ἀξιομένην πεδόθεν  
 πολύβοσκον γαίαν ἀνθρώ-  
 ποισι καὶ εὐφρονα μάλοις.  
 ἐκέλευσεν δ' αὐτίκα

<sup>1</sup> Vers. 100.

χρυσάμπυκα μὲν Λάχεσιν  
 χείρας ἀντείνει, θεῶν δ' ὄρ-  
 κον μέγαν μὴ παρφάμεν,  
 ἀλλὰ Κρόνου σὺν παιδὶ νεῦσαι  
 φαενὸν ἐς αἰθέρα μιν  
 πεμφθεῖσαν ἑᾶ κεφαλᾷ  
 ἔξοπίσω γέρας ἔσσεσθαι.

It is clear then that, according to the local fable, the island was already in being, only not yet visibly so, at this very time; and that this was the reason why it became at last, *extra sortem*, the property of the sun, in contradistinction to the right and interest of any other of the gods in any other part of the surface of the earth, obtained by lot. We demand therefore, Were the rest of the gods making this division of the rest of the earth, when the earth itself first came into existence, or only some time after? for on the answer to that question it must depend, whether the local tradition, respecting the origin of the island of Rhodes, was anything different from the general one, respecting that of the rest of the earth. And the answer to this question too is supplied by that to another; Which must have been supposed the older of the two, the gods, or the earth, in its present state? and whether there was ever a time when the former did not already stand in their proper relation to the latter, as the owners and lords of all parts thereof? For if not, then this division of the rest of the earth among the gods must have been as old as the origin of the earth; and the origin of the island of Rhodes too must have been as old as that of any other part of the earth: its actual appearance upon the surface of the earth only must have been somewhat later than that of any other part of the earth.

It is clear therefore that this particular fable of the origin of Rhodes was but a modification of the common tradition and belief respecting the origin of the rest of the earth; purposely invented to account for the fact of its having been from the first in some particular manner sacred to the sun. It was the popular cosmogony of the time applied to the case of Rhodes in particular; as born of the deep and of darkness, like the rest, but for a particular reason, and with a view to a particular effect, somewhat later than the rest—as the last of these births of the deep and of darkness themselves.



SECTION III.—*On the local tradition concerning the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes.*

The same Ode of Pindar proceeds to relate how the island of Rhodes having been already allotted to the sun, before it was yet visible, became his as soon as it appeared above the surface of the sea, and continued to be his ever after—

Τελεύτα-  
σαν δὲ λόγων κορυφαί  
ἐν ἀλαθείᾳ πετόισαι.  
βλάσ τε μὲν ἔξ ἀλὸς ὑγρᾶς  
νᾶσος, ἔχει τὲ μιν ὀ-  
ξειᾶν ὁ γενέθλιος ἀκτίνων πατήρ,  
πῦρ πνεόντων ἀρχὸς ἵππων<sup>m</sup>.

Nor is any ancient fact better attested than that of this consecration of the island of Rhodes to the sun—

Phœbeamque Rhodon et Ialysios 'Telchinas<sup>n</sup>.

Pelagique potens Phœbeïa donis  
Exornata Rhodos<sup>o</sup>.

'Tumque domus vere solis, cui tota sacrata est<sup>p</sup>.

Καὶ αὐτῶν γε τούτων τῶν θεῶν Ῥόδου μὲν Ἡλίου Ὀγχηστὸς δὲ Ποσειδῶνος<sup>q</sup>—Τῆς Ἡλιάδος ἀψάμενοι Ῥόδου τὸ συνεχὲς τοῦ μεταξὺ πλοῦ διαναπαῖσαι πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐκρίναμεν<sup>r</sup>—Ὁ δὲ Ἥλιος τελευταῖα δὴ τότε ἐπέλαμπε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν<sup>s</sup>—Οὐκ αἰσχύεσθε τὸν Ἥλιον, ὃς τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις θεατῆς ἐστὶ τῶν γιγνομένων, ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ ἀρχηγετῆς; οὐχ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν ἠγήσεται ταύτην πρώτην εἶναι τῇ νήσῳ τῆς γενέσεως ὅτ' ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης ἀνίει δῶρον τῷ θεῷ;<sup>t</sup> The celebrated Colossus, one of the seven wonders of the world\*, was an image of the sun. The oldest,

\* Opuscula Mythologica, Anonymus, De Incredibilibus, Cap. 2: The ἑπτὰ θαύματα: the seventh, Ὁ ἐν Ῥόδῳ Κολοσσὸς πηχέων ὁ, ὃν ἐποίησε Χάρης ὁ Λίνδιος. Anthologia, i. 75. Simonides, lxxxiii: Poetæ Minores. lxxxv:

Τὸν ἐν Ῥόδῳ κολοσσὸν ὀκτάκις δέκα  
Δάχης ἐποίει πηχέων ὁ Λίνδιος—

Cf. Strabo, xiv. 2. who reads ἑπτάκις δέκα. Also Eustathius, ad Dionys.

<sup>m</sup> Vers. 124.

<sup>n</sup> Ovid. Metam. vii. 365.

<sup>o</sup> Lucan, Pharsalia, v. 50. cf. vii. 247.

<sup>p</sup> Manilius, Astron. iv. 765.

<sup>q</sup> Dio Chrys. Corinthiaca, xxxvii.

106. 35.

<sup>r</sup> Lucian, Opp. ii. 405. De Amoribus, cap. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Aristides, Ῥοδιακὸς, xliii. i. 804. 3.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. xlii. Περὶ Ὀμοιοτάς, i. 840. 12.

the most sacred, the principal and most solemn, of the national observances of the Rhodians, was their Ἑλευθερία or feast of the sun. The ancients have remarked on a certain peculiarity of the climate of Rhodes, which would appear to have been only in character with this its relation to the sun; viz. that the sky was never so cloudy there, but that the sun could be seen some time in the course of every day of the year: Rhodi et Syracusis nunquam tanta nubila obduci ut non aliqua hora sol cernatur<sup>v</sup>—Nunquam ita cælum nubilum est ut in sole Rhodos non sit<sup>x</sup>. Hence the epithet of *clara* in Latin, applied to it not so much for its ancient renown as for the brightness of its sky, and this property of its atmosphere—

Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon<sup>y</sup>—

Claramque relinquit

Sole Rhodon<sup>z</sup>—

Aut claram Rhodon<sup>a</sup>.

It appears too that at Rhodes Helius, Apollo, and Dionysos were considered to be the same person under different names<sup>b</sup>: Καίτοι τὸν μὲν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὸν Ἥλιον καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἐνιοί φασιν εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν, καὶ ὑμεῖς νομίζετε· πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀπλῶς τοὺς θεοὺς πάντα εἰς μίαν τινα ἰσχὺν καὶ δύναμιν συνάγουσιν· ὥστε μηδὲν διαφέρειν τὸ τοῦτον ἢ ἐκέινον τιμᾶν<sup>c</sup>.

That the Rhodian fable then concerning the origin of the island recognised one of the two Principles, which made up the Cosmogonic Duad everywhere, and that the active or masculine one, in the person and under the name of the sun, is evident; and an active and masculine principle of that kind must vouch for a passive and feminine one, in some manner or other associated with it. The only question can be, What could that have been? and What was it called?

Perieg. 504: Festus, iii. 87. Colossus . . . fuit enim apud Rhodum insulam statua Jovis alta pedes centum et quinque: Sextus Emp. vii. Adversus Logicos, i. § 107, 108. 391, 392: Anthologia, iv. 166. Ἀδέσποτα, ccxxxviii. ii. 20. Antipater Sidonius, lii. 3: cf. Suidas in Κολοσσαεύς. For the date of its being thrown down, see our Origines Kalendariae Italicae, iv. 127.

<sup>v</sup> Pliny, H. N. ii. 62.

<sup>x</sup> Solinus, Polyh. xi. 32.

<sup>y</sup> Horace, Od. i. vii. 1.

<sup>z</sup> Lucan, Pharsalia, viii. 247.

<sup>a</sup> Martial, iv. 55. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Dio Chrysost. Rhodiaca, xxxi. 570.

31.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid.

And here we must again have recourse to the local tradition of the island, in which every thing appears to have been special of its kind; the cosmogony of the rest of the world in general, modified and circumstantiated so as to apply to the island of Rhodes in particular.

It appears from the testimony of the same Ode of Pindar, that this local tradition invested the island itself with the attributes of personality; so that 'Ρόδος in this fable, though the name of the island, was as much a person, and as much a reality, as the Egyptian Isis, the Eleusinian Demeter, or the Cretan Rhea: and what is more, a feminine reality of its proper kind, and a cosmogonic reality, the proper coordinate of the masculine idea and impersonation in the cosmogony of Rhodes in particular; out of whose union with it sprang the first and oldest of the races, next to the Telchines, which occupied Rhodes in succession—the 'Ηλιάδαι, the children of 'Ηλιος and 'Ρόδος.

Ἔνθα Ῥόδῳ ποτὲ μιχθεῖς  
τέκεν ἑπτὰ σοφώ-  
τατα νοήματ' ἐπὶ προτέρων  
ἀνδρῶν παραδεξαμένους  
παῖδας<sup>d</sup>—

Τὴν δὲ Ῥόδον τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον λαὸς αὐτόχθων ἐνέμοντο, ὧν ἦρχε τὸ Ἡλιαδῶν γένος κ', τ. λ. ε—Χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον προαισθημένους τοὺς Τελχίνας τὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι κατακλυσμὸν ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν νῆσον καὶ διασπαρῆναι . . . τοῦ δὲ κατακλυσμοῦ γενομένου τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους διαφθαρῆναι, τῆς δὲ νῆσου διὰ τὴν ἐπομβρία, ἐπιπολασάντων τῶν ὑγρῶν, λιμνάσαι τοὺς ἐπιπέδους τόπους . . ."Ἡλιον δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸν μῦθον ἐρασθέντα τῆς Ῥόδου τὴν τε νῆσον ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὀνομάσαι Ῥόδον καὶ τὸ ἐπιπολάζον ὕδωρ ἀφανίσαι . . . ἀκολουθῶς δὲ τούτοις νομισθῆναι τὴν νῆσον ἱερὰν Ἡλίου, καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένους Ῥοδίου διατελέσαι περιττότερον τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τιμῶντας τὸν Ἡλιον, ὡς ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ γένους αὐτῶν<sup>f</sup>. The flood here alluded to is the Flood of Ogyges; which Diodorus himself distinguishes from that of Deucalion, later than the time of these Heliadæ. Consequently it was the flood of Noah; the proper terminator of the antediluvian and the postdiluvian state of things: and the Telchines, the last before the flood

<sup>d</sup> Pindar, Olymp. vii. 131.  
Διηγῆσεις, xlvii.

<sup>f</sup> Diodorus Sic. v. 56.

<sup>e</sup> Photius, Bibl. Codex 186. p. 141: Conon,  
\* Ibid. 57.

of Noah, representing the last of the antediluvian race of men, the Heliadæ, the oldest of those after it, represented the first of the postdiluvian. It is no objection therefore to this Rhodian cosmogony, that it did not pass beyond the Deluge, if it went as far back as the beginning of the postdiluvian state of things.

SECTION IV. — *On the etymon and meaning of the name of*  
Ῥόδος.

There was then in the Cosmogonic Duad of the Rhodian fable a proper feminine principle which it called Ῥόδος; corresponding to the masculine, which it called Ἥλιος or Ἡλιος. The question therefore which next presents itself is, What was the meaning of this name? The ancients have handed down no satisfactory explanation of it; and the name having been commonly treated by them as that of a person, the explanations which have been given of it are genealogical rather than etymological, and tell us who the person so called was, not why she was so called.

According to some of the authorities of Diodorus<sup>h</sup>, Ῥόδος was the daughter of Ποσειδῶν and Ἄλεια, a sister of the Telchines; according to Apollodorus<sup>i</sup> and others she was the daughter of Ποσειδῶν and Ἀμφιτρίτη: according to others of Ποσειδῶν and Ἀφροδίτη, or a daughter of Ὠκεανὸς by some mother or other<sup>k</sup>: Ἠρόφιλος δὲ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης τὴν Ῥόδον εἶναί φησιν, Ἐπιμενίδης δὲ αὐτὴν Ὠκεανοῦ γενεαλογεῖ, ἀφ' ἧς τὴν πόλιν ὠνομάσθαι. The first of these genealogies, it is easy to see, must have been invented to connect the postdiluvian Rhodus with the antediluvian world; the rest are such as might easily have been imagined for an island regarded as a person.

It is observable however that, if we again refer to Pindar, (the oldest and most authentic authority for these popular traditions of the Rhodians,) we shall perceive that he must have known of Ῥόδος under no other genealogical relation than that of the daughter of Aphrodite, nor under any other personal one, than that of the νύμφη or bride of the sun, or Ἥλιος.

<sup>h</sup> v. 55.

<sup>i</sup> Bibliotheca, i. iv. § 6.

<sup>k</sup> Schol. ad Pind. Ol. vii. 24.

Καὶ νῦν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων  
 σὺν Διαγόρᾳ κατέβαν, τὰν ποιντίαν  
 ὑμέων παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας,  
 Ἄελίοιό τε νύμφαν,  
 Ῥόδον<sup>l</sup>—

Hellanicus too, referred to by the scholiast<sup>m</sup>, knew of her simply as Ῥόδος the wife of Helius and the mother of the Heliadae.

Let it therefore be assumed that, according to the oldest and most genuine form of the popular Rhodian tradition concerning the origin of their island, Rhodos was simply the daughter of Aphrodite, and the bride of Helius. This conception of the Aphrodite of antiquity came into being in the island of Cyprus along with the correction of Kinyras, to which we alluded supra<sup>n</sup>, B. C. 1301 : and no explanation of this traditionary relation of the Rhodian Ῥόδος to the Cyprian Ἀφροδίτη would be more natural or more probable than that which would be supplied by the fact that Rhodes also had its Cyclico-Julian Correction, ultimately founded upon, and derived from, that of Cyprus ; and even its proper passive and feminine principle in its proper Cosmogonic Duad, derived in like manner from that of the Cyprian. Nor would anything more be implied by the traditionary account of this relation, than that the first idea of the Rhodian Rhodos was borrowed from that of the Cyprian Aphrodite ; the first idea of the Rhodian correction was suggested by the Cyprian ; and the proper Rhodian cosmogony, associated with it, *mutatis mutandis*, was the counterpart of the Cyprian.

To come however to the etymon of the name itself. The most obvious explanation, at first sight, would be to derive it from ῥόδον—and this appears to have occurred to the scholiasts and commentators of antiquity<sup>o</sup> : Τιτῆς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆν (τῆν νῆσον) φασὶ κληθῆναι οὕτω διὰ τὸ σπονδαῖα ἔχειν ῥόδα. But though this would be admissible in point of etymology, yet for ought which is known to the contrary it would be objectionable in point of fact : for it does not appear, (from testimony of any kind at least, at present,) that Rhodes was more famous for its roses than any other of the islands in its vicinity. The scholiast on the same place<sup>n</sup> proposes another

<sup>l</sup> vii. 23.<sup>m</sup> Ad. vers. 135.<sup>n</sup> Page 236.<sup>o</sup> Schol. in Pind. ad Ol. vii. 24.

and a very different explanation : Οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ ῥοώδη εἶναι τὰ περὶ αὐτήν : i. e. because the sea in its vicinity was rough and surgy—*ῥοώδης* or *fluctuosa*—which would derive the name from *ῥόος ῥοῦς*, *fluctus*. Yet to this too it might be objected that it was no more applicable to the island of Rhodes than to any other, because all islands in this respect are more or less situated alike ; all are washed by the sea, and the sea about them all is more or less billowy and surgy.

It may be inferred however from this latter explanation in particular that, in the opinion of those who proposed it, it was no difficulty that while the etymon itself was *ῥόος ῥοῦς*, the name derived from it was *ῥόδος* ; i. e. in passing from the form of *ῥόος* to that of *ῥόδος*, it assumed the *δ* between the *ρο* and the *ος*. And with respect to this letter itself ; it appears from the grammarians and lexicographers, that in one or other of the different Greek dialects it was interchangeable with various others ; in the Ionic with *ζ* (Δεὺς for Ζεὺς, Δόρξ for Ζόρξ) ; in the Æolic with *β* (Σάμβαλον for Σάνδαλον, Ὀδελος for Ὀβελος) ; in the Doric with *γ* (Δᾶ for Γᾶ, Ἀμέρδω for Ἀμέργω, Δνόφος for Γνόφος<sup>p</sup>) : and this last is that instance of the substitution of the letter *δ* for any other, to which we would direct the attention of the reader, in explanation of the name of 'Ρόδος.

The name of the Pomegranate in some of the Greek dialects was Σίδη or Σίβδη\*—

ῥΩ κῶραι τὸ δ' ἔρευθος ἀνέδραμε, πρῶϊον οἶαν  
ἢ ῥόδον ἢ σίβδας κόκκος ἔχει χροῖαν<sup>q</sup>.

And *σίδιον* was the name for the peel of the pomegranate<sup>r</sup>. But the common name of the pomegranate in Greek was *ῥόα* and *ῥόα* in the Attic dialect, as we learn both from Mæris and from Galen, was pronounced and written *ῥοία* ; a distinction which, though apparently slight, is of importance to the present question : because it proves that something was necessary to obviate the unpleasantness of the concurrence

\* For instance in the Bœotian, Athenæus, xiv. 64. Hence the name given to many places anciently ; Σίδη in Bœotia, Σίδη in Pamphylia, Σιδούς in the Corinthian territory.

<sup>p</sup> Cf. supra, vol. iv. 172. Diss. ii.

<sup>q</sup> Callimachus, In lavacrum Palladis, 27.

<sup>r</sup> Dioscorides, De Materia Medica, i. ρνγ'.

of the vowels *o* and *a*, which come together in *ρόα* with nothing between them: but in the Attic was corrected by inserting the *ι*, and in the other dialects might have been so by the interposition of the digamma, *ρόφα* for *ρόα*, and in the Doric in particular, by the interchange of *Γ* with *Δ*, 'Ρόδα instead of 'Ρόφα.

SECTION V.—On the Βαλαύστιον, or *Mystical Emblem, of the Rhodian cosmogony.*

And here it is necessary to remind the reader of that peculiar device to which we alluded before<sup>s</sup> as discovered both on the remains of the Rhodian Diotæ, and on the coins of Rhodes: and therefore, for some reason or other, a characteristic of the island. The learned have given it the name of the Balaustium; and we must now proceed to adduce what the ancients have told us in explanation of the Balaustium.

Βαλαύστιόν ἐστιν ἄνθος ἀγρίας ροίᾶς· εἶδη δὲ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ πλείονα. εὐρίσκεται γὰρ καὶ λευκὸν καὶ πυρρὸν καὶ ροδόχρουν. εἶοικε δὲ κυτίνῳ ροίᾶς· χυλίζεται δὲ ὡς ἡ ὑποκιστὶς. δύναμιν δὲ ἔχει στυπτικὴν, ποιοῦσαν πρὸς ἅ καὶ ἡ ὑποκιστὶς καὶ ὁ κύτινος<sup>t</sup>—Sed circa Carthaginem Punicum malum cognomine sibi vindicat (Africa); aliqui granatum appellant<sup>v</sup>—Flos balaustium vocatur, et medicinis idoneus, et tingendis vestibibus, quarum color inde nomen accepit<sup>x</sup>—Primus pomi hujus partus florere incipientis cytinus vocatur Græcis; miræ observationis, multorum experimento<sup>y</sup>—In hoc ipso cytino flosculi sunt, antequam scilicet malum ipsum prodeat erumpentes; quos balaustium vocari diximus<sup>z</sup>—

Carpite, Narcissique comas sterilisque balausti<sup>a</sup>.

It appears from these testimonies that Βαλαύστιον was the name in Greek for the flower of the wild pomegranate, not the garden pomegranate; of the pomegranate in a state of nature, not as the subject of training and culture: and that too is a significant distinction, as we may see by and by. It appears too that the Βαλαύστιον was that part of the wild

<sup>s</sup> Page 178.

<sup>t</sup> Dioscorides, De Materia Medica, i.

κεφ. ρνδ'.

<sup>v</sup> Pliny, H. N. xiii. 34.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. xxiii. 59.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 60.

<sup>a</sup> Columella, Res Rust. x. De Hortor. Cultura, 297.

flower which ultimately produced the fruit; corresponding in that, to the part called *κύντος* in the garden or domesticated tree<sup>b</sup>.

There can be little doubt, in our opinion, that a mystical meaning was concealed under this emblem, in its peculiar relation to the island of Rhodes: and in order to discover what this was, we may refer first of all to the correction of the primitive calendar, at Damascus, on the opposite continent of Syria, and to the proper style and title of the Cosmogonic Duad, which appears to have been introduced along with it there. For though this Damascene Correction was certainly late in the chronological order of such corrections, yet this too was founded on the Egyptian prototype of the same kind, and was accompanied with the recognition of the same Cosmogonic Principles, a masculine and a feminine one, as any of the oldest before it: differing from the rest in *this* respect only, that the Cosmogonic Duad at Damascus, instead of two distinct persons with two different names, one for each, appears to have consisted of two distinct persons, under one name common to both, or two distinct names in one, as if belonging to one person: Hadad-Rimmon. Now Hadad, it is agreed, was the Syrian name for the sun, ἥλιος in Greek; and Rimmon was the Syrian name for a plantation of pomegranates, *ροιδόν* in Greek—which in its secondary sense might be transferred to the idea of a multitude of pomegranates; and (if there was any thing in the pomegranate to make it the type of fecundity or productiveness) to the idea of the impersonated principle of productiveness and fecundity itself.

It is clear then that if we may suppose the name of Ῥόδος to have been really derived from the Greek *ρόα*, a pomegranate; this name of Hadad-Rimmon in the Syriac could have been neither more nor less than Ἡλιόρροδος in Greek—nothing more nor less than the sun, and the pomegranate-power, or principle, in a certain relation to each other. And if there was no difference, but that of name, between Hadad and Helios, or between Rimmon and Rhodos, and Hadad

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Hesychius, in *Κύντοι*, τῆς *ροϊᾶς* τὰ *πρῶτα* *ἐξανθήματα*: Theophr. De Causis, i. 14 ad fin. *ἐν γὰρ τῷ* *κν-*

*τίνω* τὸ *ἄνθος* (τῆς *ρόας*): Nicander, Theriaca, 870, and the Scholia in loc.



and Rimmon were the two principles of the Cosmogonic Duad of Damascus; Helios and Rhodos must have been the two constituent principles of the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes. The sun and the pomegranate-power composed the Duad of each. The pomegranate was the type of the partner of the sun, in each; and no doubt for the same reason, that no other emblem in nature was so well qualified to denote the Cosmogonic principle, especially the passive or feminine one, in the abstract, as this.

The pomegranate was distinguished from other fruits of trees by the multitude of its seeds, as was implied in its name of the *malum granatum* itself; and each of these seeds being the germ of a future plant, it was so far a lively type of productiveness, both in the *principle* and in the *effect*; both in the life-giving power inherent in the proper subject, and in the number and variety of its energies and operations. Another peculiarity of this fruit was that these numerous seeds, all instinct with life, all embryos of a future living thing, lay embedded within it, in a natural pulp or matrix, which resembled externally an animal much more than a vegetable substance; being of a deep blood-red colour, like that of the flesh of animals. And hence probably another of its names in the Latin language, that of the *malum punicum*, as well as the *malum granatum*, the purple apple, as much as the many-grained apple; for punicus has in Latin the sense of puniceus, or purple, as well as that of Punic<sup>c</sup>. Columella insists on this peculiarity in the flower of the pomegranate also—

Mox ubi sanguineis se floribus induit arbos  
Punica<sup>d</sup>—

but it is more striking in the fruit, or the pulp within the rind, in which the seeds lie embedded.

These two peculiarities, the multitude of the seeds of this fruit, and the animal-like substance in which they lay embedded, were well qualified to designate it as the type and symbol, *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*, of the life-giving principle in a twofold capacity; both as diffusing and propagating itself on the largest scale, (intimated by the multitude of the seeds of this fruit.) and as

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Forcellini Lex. in voce.

<sup>d</sup> De Re Rust. x. De Hort. Cult. 242.

beginning its energies in the vegetable or lower forms of life, yet consummating them in the animal or highest—implied by the appearance of the natural bed in which these seeds lay buried. It is no wonder then that we find it in more than one instance selected to be the type of the passive or feminine principle in the work of universal production, and associated with the mysteries of antiquity every where\*. And this mystical construction of the symbol sufficiently ex-

\* The earliest recognition in classical antiquity of the *ροιά*, or pomegranate, in its proper mystical sense, makes part of the fable of the Raptus; in which a single grain of this fruit, tasted by the *Κόρη*, was supposed to have the effect of rendering her permanent restoration to the upper world an impossibility<sup>1</sup>. According to the tradition of Cyprus<sup>2</sup>, the pomegranate was planted by the Cyprian Aphrodite herself, that is, the feminine principle in the Cosmogonic Duad there; and it was the only one wont to be planted in honour of Hera<sup>3</sup>. It is enumerated among the mystical symbols by Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>4</sup>: Οὐχὶ δὲ ροιαὶ πρὸς τοῖσδε καὶ κραδία; and abstinence from it was strictly enjoined both preparatory to and during the mysteries: Ὡσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ αἱ Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι τῆς ροιάς τοὺς κόκκους παραφυλάττουσιν ἐσθίειν, τοὺς ἀποπεπτωκότας χαμαὶ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Διονύσου αἵματος σιαγόνων βεβλαστηκῆναι νομίζουσι τὰς ροιάς<sup>5</sup>: which is corrupt, but may be corrected by reading, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν πεπτωκότων χαμαὶ τοῦ Διονύσου αἵματος σταγόνων βεβλαστηκῆναι νομίζουσαι τὰς ροιάς—Καὶ σῦκα μὲν ἐσθίεσθαι φησι, ροιάς δὲ οὐκέτι, καὶ μῆλα πρὸς τούτοις<sup>6</sup>—Ῥοιάς δὲ ὡς φυτὸν χθόνιον παρητήσατο<sup>7</sup>.

The pomegranate is said to have been sacred to Hermes also<sup>8</sup>. Ancient Greek mythology recognises a *Ῥοιώ*—which would be the literal version of the Hebrew or Syriac Rimmon—as the supposed mother of Anius, king of Delos, and priest of Apollo there, and the daughter of Staphylus, son of Dionysos—

Ἐν οὐδ' ὁ Ῥοιοῦς ἴνις εὐνάζων μένος<sup>9</sup>  
σχήσει—

Æschylus has an allusion to the pomegranate, in *Incertis fabulis*—

Ὁξυγλυκεῖαν τᾶρα κοκκιῆς ρόαν—

Probably one of his Satyri. See Dindorf, *Fragmenta*, 318. But nothing mystical appears to have been intended by this allusion.

<sup>1</sup> See supra, vol. iv. 299. 306. Dissert. ii. cf. Apollodorus *Bibl.* i. v. § 3.

<sup>2</sup> Athenæus, iii. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* iv. 9. 186 B.

<sup>4</sup> *Protrepticon*, ii. § 22. pag. 19. 1. 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* ii. § 19. pag. 17. 29.

<sup>6</sup> Julianus Imperator, v: In Matrem Deum, 174 B.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 176 B. cf. Porphyry *De Abstinencia*, iv. 16, 353.

<sup>8</sup> Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vi. xv. § 132. p. 180. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Lycophron, 570. cf. the Scholia.

plains the reason why the symbol itself should have been restricted to the *Βαλαύστιον*, the flower of the pomegranate in its natural wildness; and not have been extended to the *Κύτινος* also, the same flower altered and modified by the hand and art of man.

We have no doubt therefore that the ultimate explanation of the name of 'Ρόδος, in the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes, is to be found in the same association of ideas as that of Rimmon in the Cosmogonic Duad of Damascus; that each was the proper name of the passive or feminine principle in its own system; that the etymon of each was the same in its own language as that of the other, the vernacular name of the pomegranate; that as so derived, and in its secondary sense, each was the name of an idea and a person, whom we may call the pomegranate-power or principle; the life-giving principle, both in the vegetable and in the animal world, as characterised by diffusiveness and fecundity on the largest scale.

SECTION VI.—*On the probable date of the Cyclico-Julian Correction of Rhodes.*

To apply these conclusions to the question which we are considering, that of the proper cyclico-Julian correction of the ancient Rhodes; i. We have shewn that there was a proper cosmogony among the ancient Rhodians which assumed the production of their own island, like that of the rest of the world, originally out of water. ii. It has been seen that in this cosmogonic system there was both a proper masculine and a proper feminine principle, to the cooperation of which every form of life, both vegetable and animal, within their own island, owed its existence. iii. It has been seen that the masculine principle in this Duad was the sun, the feminine was one which itself bore the name of Rhodos, and gave the name of Rhodos to the island; a name which, when it comes to be analysed and traced up to its first principles, is found to have been taken from the property of productiveness, and of the diffusion of life, on the largest scale which could be supposed to have characterised such a power, within the sphere of its natural operation.

Now these are strong grounds of inference *a priori* that so

peculiar a cosmogony, at the time when it was first introduced and embodied in a fable like this, must have been accompanied with a Correction of the calendar; because the history of such fables and such systems in other instances demonstrates that they were never considered to be complete. or calculated to answer the end and purpose designed by them, without such Corrections, which served to keep them in mind ever after. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the Rhodian system of this kind, though limited in its scope and comprehension to the particular case of the island of Rhodes, would be any exception to the general rule which regulated the course of these proceedings in every other instance; that of commemorating the first introduction of such principles and doctrines, and fixing and perpetuating them in their practical effects and consequences, by some corresponding affection of the calendar.

What then, it may be demanded, was the probable date of this correction in Rhodes? In answer to which, we observe, that if we have reasoned rightly from the mythological genealogy of Rhodos, according to Pindar, as the daughter of Aphrodite, the earliest date of this Rhodian correction could not have been earlier than the Paphian correction of Kinyras, Athyr 17, Æra Cyc. 2706, September 23, B. C. 1301; nor in fact earlier than the second cyclico-Julian period proper to that correction, Athyr 17, Æra Cyclica 2826, August 25, B. C. 1181. But if the first idea of the Rhodian Rhodos was really derived from the Paphian Aphrodite, and the Rhodian correction of the primitive calendar was really modelled on the Paphian one of Kinyras, it might, and very probably would, be made at this very time, Athyr 17, Æra Cyclica 2826, August 25, B. C. 1181. It would as naturally bear date at the beginning of the second cyclico-Julian period of the Cyprian correction, as that itself at the beginning of the first.

And here the date of the Rhodian "Αλεια, the principal solemnity in Rhodes, comes in critically to confirm this conclusion. It is by all means to be supposed that, if Rhodes had a cyclico-Julian correction of its own, which came into being along with its peculiar cosmogony and cosmogonic Duad, the proper date of this correction, and the stated date

of the proper solemnity in honour of the masculine and active principle in this Duad in particular, the sun, in the first instance, must have been the same. Now in the lunar calendar of later times, as we have seen, this stated date was the 24th of Hyakinthius. Let us then, through this later lunar date, endeavour to recover the original Julian one, from which even this was sometime taken.

For this purpose, the only state of the lunar calendar, which can with propriety be assumed, is the rectified or normal one; and beginning with that of the Metonic correction of Rhodes, adapted to the epoch of B. C. 382, we have the first four months of the calendar at that time as follows.

*Metonic Calendar of Rhodes.*

Period i. 1. Cycle i. 1: B. C. 382.

Artamitius	May	6 30 days	Pedageitnyus	July 5	Ex. 3.
Panamus	June	5 30	Hyakinthius	Aug. 3	

24 Hyakinthius August 26.

Secondly, if we go back to Period i. 1, Cycle i. 1, of the third type of the old octaëteris, B. C. 542, we have the scheme of the calendar at that time also, on the supposition that the months alternated 30 and 29, not 29 and 30, days in length respectively, as follows.

*Octaëteric Calendar at Rhodes.*

Period i. 1. Cycle i. 1. B. C. 542.

Agrianus	Jan.	7	Artamitius	May	5
Badromius	Feb.	6	Panamus	June	4
Theudæsius	Mar.	7	Pedageitnyus	July	3
Dalius	April	6	Hyakinthius	Aug.	2

24 Hyakinthius August 25.

It follows that in the first year of the proper Metonic correction of the Rhodians, the Julian date of the 24th of the lunar Hyakinthius was August 26, and in the first year of the proper octaëteric correction it was August 25; from which coincidence we may reasonably infer that it must have

been one of these two Julian terms, either August 26, or August 25, from the first. And having to decide between them, we cannot hesitate to conclude that it must have been August 25, before the adoption of the lunar correction, if it was Hyakinthius 24, in that correction, ever after. The 24th of the first lunar Hyakinthius, B. C. 542, we see coincided with August 25; and if it coincided with August 25, B. C. 542, in the first year of the first cycle of the old octaëteric correction, when first coming into existence, it is easy to see that B. C. 382, when the epoch of the correction was raised one day, in the first year of the first cycle of the Metonic correction it must coincide with August 26.

It follows that the stated Julian date of the ἙΛεία, at Rhodes, older than the lunar correction there itself, must have been August 25, precisely the same to which we have determined the date of a cyclico-Julian correction, which might have come into being there, Athyr 17, Æra Cyclica 2826, August 25, B. C. 1181. And this is too remarkable a coincidence to have been produced by chance. But there is still something more to be said on this point, preliminary to which we must begin with collecting the testimonies of antiquity to the colonisation of Rhodes by Tlepolemus, and to the institution of the Τληπολέμεια, and to their association with the ἙΛεία, there also.

SECTION VII.—*On the Rhodian Colony under Tlepolemus; and on the Rhodian Τληπολέμεια.*

- i. Τληπόλεμος δ' Ἑρακλείδης, ἧς τε μέγας τε,  
 ἐκ Ῥόδου ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερώχων,  
 οἱ Ῥόδον ἀμφενέμοντο διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες,  
 Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργυρόντα Κάμειρον.  
 τῶν μὲν Τληπόλεμος δουρικλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν,  
 ὃν τέκεν Ἀστυόχεια βίη Ἑρακληΐη,  
 τὴν ἄγειτ' ἐξ Ἐφύρης, ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος,  
 πέρσας ἄστυα πολλὰ διοτρεφῶν αἰζηῶν.  
 Τληπόλεμος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφη ἐν μεγάρῳ ἐϋπήκτω,  
 αὐτίκα πατρὸς ἐοῖο φίλον μήτρῳα κατέκτα,  
 ἤδη γηράσκοντα Δικύμνιον, ὄζον Ἄρηος.  
 αἰψα δὲ νῆας ἔπηξε, πολὺν δ' ὄγε λαὸν ἀγείρας  
 βῆ φεύγων ἐπὶ πόντον· ἀπειλήσαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι  
 υἱέες υἰόνοί τε βίης Ἑρακληΐης.  
 αὐτὰρ ὄγ' ἐς Ῥόδον ἵξεν ἀλώμενος, ἄλγεα πάσχων'

τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδὸν, ἦδ' ἐφίληθεν  
 ἐκ Διὸς, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει·  
 καὶ σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων,  
 κ', τ. λ.<sup>e</sup>

ii. Ἐβελήσω τοῖσιν ἐξ  
 ἀρχᾶς ἀπὸ Τληπολέμου  
 κ', τ. λ.<sup>f</sup>

Καὶ γὰρ Ἀλκμήνας κασίγνη-  
 τον νόθον σκάπτῳ θένων  
 σκληρᾶς ἐλαίας ἔκταν' ἐν Τί-  
 ρυνθι Λικύμνιον ἐλ-  
 θόντ' ἐκ θαλάμων Μεδέας  
 τᾶσδ' ἐποτε χθονὸς οἰκιστῆρ χολωθείς ε.

Τῷ μὲν ὁ Χρυσόκομας  
 εὐώδεος ἐξ ἀδύτου ναῶν πλόον  
 εἶπε Λερναίας ἀπ' ἀκτῶς  
 στέλλεν ἐς ἀμφιθάλασσον  
 νομόν, ἔνθα ποτὲ  
 βρέχε θεῶν βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας  
 χρυσαῖς νιφάδεσσι πόλιν,  
 ἀνίχ' Ἀφαιστοῦ τέχναισι  
 χαλκελάτῳ πελέκει  
 πατέρος Ἀθαναία κορυφὰν κατ' ἄκραν  
 ἀνορούσασ' ἀλάλα-  
 ξεν ὑπερμάκει βοᾷ κ', τ. λ.<sup>h</sup>

Τόθι λύτρον συμφορᾶς  
 οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὴ Τληπολέμῳ  
 ἴσταται, Τίρυνθίων ἀρχ-  
 αγέτα, ὥσπερ θεῶν,  
 μάλων τε κνισσάεσσα πομπὰ  
 καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισι<sup>i</sup>.

iii. Ὁ γὰρ Τληπόλεμος Λικύμνιον τὸν Ἡλεκτρύωνος παῖδα  
 νόθον, ὃς ἐγένετο ἐκ Μιδέας Φρυγίας τινὸς γυναικὸς, ἀφ' ἧς  
 καὶ ἡ πόλις κέκληται<sup>k</sup>, ἐλαίνῳ σκυτάλῳ πλήξας ἄκων ἀναιρεῖ·  
 ἐπὶ γὰρ βοῦν βουλόμενος ἀκουτίσαι τὸ σκυτάλιον ἔρριψε κατὰ  
 τοῦ Λικυμνίου<sup>l</sup>—Τληπόλεμος οὖν κτείνας οὐχ ἑκὼν Λικύμνιον,  
 (τῇ βακτηρίᾳ γὰρ αὐτοῦ θεράποντα πλήσσοιτος ὑπέδραμε,)  
 πρὶν ἐξελεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου, φεύγων οὖν μετ' οὐκ

<sup>e</sup> Iliad, B. 653.<sup>f</sup> Pind. Ol. vii. 36.<sup>g</sup> Ibid. 49.<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 58.<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 141.<sup>k</sup> Cf. ad vers. 52. Ἐλθόντ' ἐκ θαλάμων.<sup>l</sup> Schol. ad vers. 36. cf. Schol. ad Iliad. B. 662.

ὀλίγων ἦκεν εἰς Ῥόδον, κακεὶ κατόκει<sup>m</sup>—λέγεται δὲ κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν Τληπολέμου μάλιστα εὐδαιμονῆσαι Ῥοδίου, ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος μαρτυρεῖ<sup>n</sup> ... ἔστι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἱερὸν καὶ τάφος ἐν Ῥόδῳ. οἱ γὰρ συστρατευόμενοι αὐτῷ διήγαγον τὰ ὄστα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον. . . τελεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος ἐν τῇ πόλει Τληπολέμῳ, κατὰ δὲ ἑτέρους ἱερὸς Ἠλίῳ· ἀγωνίζονται δὲ παίδων ἡλικίαι, καὶ στέφονται ἐκ λεύκης<sup>o</sup>—Θυσίαι γὰρ αὐτῷ διάφοροι γίνονται, καὶ ἀγῶνες τελοῦνται<sup>p</sup>—Ἐτελείτο γὰρ αὐτῷ ἀγὼν τὰ Τληπολέμεια, ὃ δὲ νικήσας αὐτὰ λεύκην ἐλάμβανε στέφανον. ἱστορία. ὅτε οἱ Ἕλληνες εἰς Τροίαν ἐστράτευσαν, ἦν καὶ Τληπόλεμος οὗτος μετὰ Ῥοδίων. ἀποθανόντος οὖν ἐκεῖ ἦγαγον τὰ ὄστα αὐτοῦ εἰς Ῥόδον, ὡς οἰκιστοῦ ταύτης, καὶ ναὸν αὐτῷ ποιήσαντες πανήγυριν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἄγουσι τὰ λεγόμενα Τληπολέμεια. ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἀγῶνων ἄθλον λευκινὸς στέφανος κ', τ. λ. q—Ἐπεὶ φασιν ὅτι ἀγὼν ἐκεῖ ἄγεται Τληπολέμεια. οἱ δὲ Ἡράκλεια<sup>r</sup>—Κρίσιν εἶπε τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ἡλιείων, ὃν διατιθέασιν οἱ Ῥόδιοι. ἐψεύσατο δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος. οὗ γὰρ Τληπολέμῳ ὁ ἀγὼν ἐπιτελείται, τῷ δὲ Ἠλίῳ τιθέασιν τὸν ἀγῶνα, ὡς Ἰστρὸς φησὶν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν Ἠλίου ἀγῶνων Ῥόδιοι τιθέασιν Ἠλίῳ ἐν Ῥόδῳ γυμνικὸν στεφανίτην ἀγῶνα<sup>s</sup>—Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Πινδάρου ἱστορίαις εἶρον ὅτι οἱ τοῦ Τληπολέμου ἀπεσώθησαν εἰς Ῥόδον, τὴν αὐτῶν πατρίδα. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Τληπολέμου Φιλοζώη, μεγάλη δακρύσασα, ἀγῶνας ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἔθετο, καὶ παῖδες ἠγωνίζοντο, καὶ οἱ νικῶντες λεύκης φύλλοις ἐστέφοντο<sup>t</sup>.

iv. Τληπόλεμον δὲ τὸν Ἡρακλέους ἐν Ἄργει κατοικοῦντα λέγουσιν ἀνελεῖν Λικύμνιον τὸν Ἡλεκτρύονος, ἐρίσαντα περὶ τιῶν, διὰ δὲ τὸν φόρον τοῦτον ἐξ Ἄργους φυγόντα εἰς Ῥόδον κατοικῆσαι. τὴν δὲ νῆσον ταύτην τότε κατόκειν Ἕλληνες οἱ ὑπὸ Τριόπα τοῦ Φόρβαντος κατοικισθέντες. τὸν δ' οὖν Τληπόλεμον κοιῆ μετὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων τριμερῆ ποιῆσαι τὴν Ῥόδον, καὶ τρεῖς ἐν αὐτῇ καταστήσαι πόλεις, Λίνδον, Ἰήλυσον, Κάμιρον<sup>v</sup>—Βραχὺ δὲ πρὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν Τληπόλεμος ὁ Ἡρακλέους φεύγων διὰ τὸν Λικυμνίου θάνατον, ὃν ἀκουσίως ἦν ἀιηρηκῶς, ἔφυγεν ἐξ Ἄργους ἐκουσίως· χρησμὸν δὲ λαβὼν ὑπὲρ ἀποικίας, μετὰ τιῶν λαῶν κατέπλευσεν εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον κ', τ. λ. x—Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Τελχίνας, οἱ Ἰλιάδαι

<sup>m</sup> Apollodorus, Bibl. ii. viii. 2. cf. Schol. ad Nubes, 1267. ὦ σκληρὲ δαῖμον.

<sup>n</sup> Iliad. B. 670.

<sup>o</sup> Scholia Vet. ad Pindar. Olymp. vii. 36.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. ad 141.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. Schol. recentiora.

<sup>r</sup> Schol. Vet. ad 145.

<sup>s</sup> Schol. Vet. ad 146. cf. ad 147 et vide supra, page 229.

<sup>t</sup> Tzetzes, in Lycophron. 911.

<sup>v</sup> Diod. Sic. iv. 58.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. v. 59.



μυθούνται κατασχεῖν τὴν νῆσον, ὧν ἔνιοι Κερκάφον καὶ Κινδίππης γενέσθαι παῖδας τοὺς τὰς πόλεις κτίσαντας ὁμωνύμους αὐτῶν·

Λίνδον Ἰηλυσσὸν τε καὶ ἄργινόντα Κάμειρον·

ἔνιοι δὲ τὸν Τληπόλεμον κτίσαι φασι, θέσθαι δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα ὁμωνύμως τῶν Δαναοῦ θυγατέρων τισί·—Δωριεῖς δ' εἰσὶν, ὡς περ καὶ Ἀλικαρνασσεῖς, καὶ Κινδίοι, καὶ Κῶοι. οἱ γὰρ Δωριεῖς, οἱ τὰ Μέγαρα κτίσαντες, μετὰ τὴν Κόδρου τελευτήν, οἱ μὲν ἔμειναν αὐτόθι, οἱ δὲ σὺν Ἀλθαίμειρι τῷ Ἀργεῖ τῆς εἰς Κρήτην ἀποικίας ἐκουώνησαι, οἱ δ' εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον καὶ τὰς λεχθείσας ἄρτίως πόλεις ἐμερίσθησαν. ταῦτα δὲ νεώτερα τῶν ὑφ' Ὀμήρου λεγομένων ἐστὶ.<sup>2</sup>

We learn from these statements some important facts. i. From the testimony of Homer, (in which, it is evident, Strabo also concurred,) that the first Grecian colony which settled in the island of Rhodes was led thither by Tlepolemus, son of Hercules; and that he in reality was the οἰκιστὴς of the island, and the founder of the only three Grecian cities in it, known in Greek history before the συνοικισμός, B. C. 408, Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus. ii. From the testimony of Pindar, in some of his lost works, referred to by Tzetzes, and virtually confirmed by the scholia on the viith Olympic ode of Pindar, that though Tlepolemus himself fell at Troy, his followers returned, and brought back his bones to Rhodes, as those of their founder as much as their captain; and that his wife (whom Tzetzes calls Πολυζῶη and Pausanias<sup>a</sup> Πολυζῶ) both built a tomb and a temple, and founded games, in honour of him; which games continued to be celebrated ever after under the name of the Τληπολέμεια. And we may infer in like manner, from the testimony of the viith Olympic ode of Pindar itself, that these games were so near to the Ἄλεια in point of time, that they might be considered identical with them; i. e. both must have been celebrated simultaneously. On this point it is not credible that Pindar could have been mistaken, as some of the scholiasts insinuate that he was. The just inference from his mode of speaking of both these institutions is, not that one was actually the same with the other, but that both were celebrated at a common time and on a common occasion: from which

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, xiv. 2. 196, 197.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 195. cf. Apoll. Bibl. iii. ii.

§ 1: Conon, Διηγήσεις, 47: Diod. Sic.

v. 59. De Althæmene, &c.: Scholia in Theocrit. Idyll. xvii. 69.

<sup>a</sup> iii. xix. 10.

it will follow that if both were not instituted at once, one of them must have been associated with the other.

And with respect to the question, which was the older of the two, the "Αλεια or the Τληπολέμεια—the latter, it is evident, could not have been older than the return of the Rhodians from Troy; and the date of the capture of Troy, as we hope to see hereafter, having been October 19 B. C. 1181—the return could not have been earlier than the spring of B. C. 1180. But as to the "Αλεια; we have already shewn, that as dedicated to the sun, one of the two principles in the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes, and as the sign and seal of a proper correction of the primitive calendar, made at the same time, they must have been one year older at least. It is therefore in the highest degree probable that, if the "Αλεια were instituted B. C. 1181, the Τληπολέμεια were added to them B. C. 1180, and both were celebrated in conjunction, for the first time, on the stated date of the former, Aug. 25, B. C. 1180.

And yet there is reason also to believe that the association of a solemnity of another kind, and for a different purpose, with the feast of the sun, so soon after its institution, had an important effect on the Correction, appointed for the latter at first; and that though the founders of the "Αλεια, whosoever they were, having taken its date in the first instance from the primitive Athyr 17 of the time being, intended it to have been regulated by a cyclico-Julian calendar, the addition of the Τληπολέμεια, the very next year, led to the adoption of a Julian calendar, for the regulation of both in conjunction. The Julian principle, as we have often had occasion to observe, was well understood among the Greeks in general at this time. It could not, at least, have been unknown to the followers of Tlepolemus to Rhodes, from the Peloponnese, where a strictly Julian calendar had been instituted and brought into existence, sixty years at least before that migration, in the shape of the Cronian or Olympic calendar of Pelops, the 22nd cycle of the proper leap-year of which coincided with this year of the return from Troy, B. C. 1180, itself.

We thus account for the fact, which has been already ascertained from the traditionary date of each of these cere-

monies in the lunar calendar of later times, that they must have had a stated Julian date, the same *mutatis mutandis*, both B. C. 542 and B. C. 382, August 25 : the proper representative of which in the lunar calendar, from cycle i. 1. of the old octaëteris downwards, was the lunar 24. It is manifest that of a simply Julian date this was possible, but of a cyclico-Julian date, except at stated times, it was not possible. A given Julian date, in a simply Julian calendar, would be every year the same ; in a cyclico-Julian calendar only once in 120 years. There were five periods of 120 years, from B. C. 1181 to B. C. 581 ; and 39 years of a sixth, from B. C. 581 to B. C. 542. Though therefore the regular date of the Ἄλεια and the Τληπολέμεια, B. C. 581, might have been August 25, as at first, B. C. 542, in a cyclico-Julian calendar it must have been August 15 ; and as transferred from such a Julian calendar at that time to the lunar, its date in the lunar correction, both B. C. 542 and ever after, must have been the 14th of the proper lunar month, not the 24th.

The supposition therefore of a change in the nature of the Correction of the primitive calendar, made at first for the regulation of the Ἄλεια, in consequence of the association with it of the Τληπολέμεια so soon after, is absolutely necessary, in order to account for the identity of the Julian date of the institution with itself ever after. And though it might perhaps have been expected *a priori* that, if both these observances were subjected to a Julian calendar in common, the cycle of both would be a cycle of four years, (the proper cycle of the Julian leap-year,) that was no necessary consequence of the adoption of a Julian calendar. A Julian calendar was as proper for an annual as for a quadriennial observance ; and we may add, if the date of the observance was to be always the same with itself, as indispensable. The testimony of some of the passages, produced above, is express that both the Ἄλεια and the Τληπολέμεια of the Rhodians were annual ; and it is almost self-evident, from the nature of the case, that as a kind of parentalia to the memory of Tlepolemus, these latter must have been annual. The Ἄλεια must have been in course B. C. 542, when they were transferred to the lunar calendar, and attached to the 24th

of the month in that; yet the interval between B. C. 542 and B. C. 172<sup>a</sup>, is not measurable by the cycle of four years. We may presume then that each of these solemnities was annual, and had the same date in terms of the Julian calendar, from B. C. 1180 to B. C. 512 at least; August 25, in every year of the cycle as dated from B. C. 1180, except the fourth, which coincided with the first year of the proper Julian cycle of the same kind; in which consequently it would drop *pro tempore* from August 25 to August 24.

SECTION VIII.—*On the confirmation of the preceding conclusions by some general considerations.*

To these different arguments of the truth of the preceding conclusions, we may add some considerations of a more general nature, which nevertheless lead to the same inferences. i. The sun being the principal, if not the exclusive, object of worship in Rhodes, and the "Αλεια the principal festival in the Rhodian calendar, it might have been expected *a priori* that the stated time of this Rhodian solemnity in particular would be one of the cardinal points in the natural year; and especially, if circumstances had allowed any room for preference, the vernal equinox, or the summer solstice. We can discover nothing in such a Julian date as that of August 25 to connect it beforehand with such an institution as the "Αλεια. If then there was a connection between them *de facto*, it must have been accidental in its origin; and we account for that coincidence in the most natural manner, if we resolve it simply into the prevailing rule of such cyclico-Julian corrections, along with such institutions, whereby they were necessarily determined to the Julian term, which was coinciding at the time with the 17th of the primitive Athyr.

ii. The stated date of this Rhodian solemnity in honour of the sun, August 25, in the sphere of Mazzaroth was only one or, at the utmost, two days later than the ingress of the sun into Virgo<sup>b</sup>, August 24, before B. C. 672, August 23, after. Moreover, in the astrological scheme of the decania of the sphere, the sun itself was the decan of Virgo<sup>c</sup>. We need not therefore be surprised that in the astrological divi-

<sup>a</sup> See *supra*, 205 n.

<sup>b</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 304.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 485.

sion of the surface of the earth, which subjected every part of it to some proper planetary influence, the island of Rhodes was assigned to Virgo. Προσφκείωνται δ' αὐτῇ (scil. τῇ παρθένῳ) χῶραι. κατὰ μὲν τοὺς Ἀλυπτίους καὶ τὸν Δωρόθεον, Ῥόδος καὶ Κυκλάδες νῆσοι<sup>d</sup>—

Virgine sub casta felix terraque marique  
Est Rhodos<sup>e</sup>.

There can be little doubt that the astrological geography, in this particular, was influenced by the notorious fact that the Ἄλεια of the Rhodians, and virtually the birthday of the island, were attached to the second or third of the Parthenon of Mazzaroth.

iii. If the explanation which we have given of the name of Ῥόδος is founded in truth, it must follow from it that no such name for the island could have been in existence before B. C. 1181. What then was its name, (if it had any, at least,) older than B. C. 1181? The ancients have assigned it various names, both different from this of Ῥόδος, and older too—Τελχινία, Ὀφιοῦσσα, Σταδαία. Πελαγία, Αἰθραία, Asteria, Τριναερία, Corymbia, Ρωῒεσσα, Ατabyρία, and the like<sup>f</sup>: all which we may dismiss as nothing to the purpose, in answer to the present question. The true answer is ultimately supplied by the fact that, next to the Phœnicians and the Carians, the first settlers in Rhodes were Tepelemus and his followers from Argos. The three cities which fable attributed to the three sons of Helius. Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus, were in reality founded by him. Nor is there anything incredible *a priori* in the fact which is mentioned by Strabo, that the names of these three cities were taken by Tepelemus from those of three of the daughters of Danaus. The coming of Danaus to Argos was nearly 150 years older than the migration of Tepelemus to Rhodes: and tradition appears to have handed it down among the Greeks, that Danaus and his daughters, before their coming to Argos, had thought of settling in Rhodes: had landed at least at Rhodes, on

<sup>d</sup> Hephæstio Thebanus. cf. Meursii Rhodus, ii. cap. 2. Opp. iii. 687 D. Proclus, in Tetrabiblum.

<sup>e</sup> Manilius, iv. 763.

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Diodor. v. 58: Pliny, H. N. v. 36: Strabo, xiv. 2. 196 b: Eustathius,

ad Dionys. Perieg. 504: Ammian. Marcellinus, xvii. 7. 137: Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 85. ad ann. 276. Jerome, in Chronico, ad ann. 276. Steph. de Urbibus, in nomine.

their way to the Peloponnese, and had founded a temple there, on what was afterwards the site of Lindus, in honour of the Egyptian Isis, and according to the tradition of posterity, under the name of the Lindian Athena<sup>g</sup>: and that while they were there, three of them, according to Diodorus, died there, after which three, most probably, Tlepolemus called his three settlements.

Now of the three original settlements of the Greeks in Rhodes, this of Lindus appears to have been the principal one. Strabo has described it more particularly than either of the other two<sup>h</sup>; Ἔστι δὲ πρώτη μὲν Λίνδος, ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως πλέουσιν, ἐν δεξιᾷ ἔχουσι τὴν νῆσον, πόλις ἐπὶ ὄρους ἰδρυμένη, πολλὴ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν ἀνατείνουσα . . . ἱερὸν δὲ ἐστὶν Ἀθηνᾶς Λινδίας αὐτόθι ἐπιφανές, τῶν Δαναΐδων ἴδρυμα<sup>i</sup>. It is far from improbable therefore that it was the metropolis of the island in Tlepolemus' time; and the seat of his own residence. It was in the Acropolis of Lindus at least that the first sacrifice to Athena, according to tradition, was offered by him and his followers. Lindus therefore having been the principal of the first three cities, founded by the Greeks in the island, and the seat of the temple of Athena herself, (the oldest and most sacred of any in the island, and almost anywhere else among the Greeks,) it would be nothing extraordinary that it should have given name to the island itself. A gloss occurs in Suidas, Ῥόδος ἡ νῆσος, ἣτις καὶ Λίνδος καλεῖται<sup>k</sup>. We may infer then that the most ancient name of the island was this of Λίνδος—given it probably by the daughters of Danaus; though, as an older name than that of Ῥόδος, it would be quite sufficient if it was due simply to the foundation of Lindus by Tlepolemus, twenty-five years at least before the introduction of the Cosmogonic Duad, and the correction of the Primitive Calendar, B. C. 1181—out of which the name of Ῥόδος for the island itself appears to have arisen.

<sup>g</sup> Parian Chron. Epoch. ix: Herod. ii. 182: iii. 47: Schol. in Iliad. A. 42. Δαναοί: Diodor. Sic. v. 58: Strabo, xiv. 2. 198 b.

<sup>h</sup> xiv. 2. 198 a.

<sup>i</sup> Cf. Eustath. ad Iliad. B. 656. 315. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Hesychius in Λίνδος also, and the MS. gloss there quoted in the notes: Λίνδος . . . χώρα ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ, ἣ καὶ νῆσος. If Lindus was the name of an island, it must have been that of the island of Rhodes.

SECTION IX.—On the Athena of Lindus, and the local tradition concerning the first sacrifice in Rhodes to the Lindian Athena.

- i. Τότε καὶ φανσίβροτος  
δαίμων Ὑπεριονίδα  
μέλλον ἔντειλεν φυλάξα-  
σθαι χρέος παισὶν φίλοις,  
ὡς ἂν θεῆ πρῶτοι κτίσαιεν  
βωμὸν ἑναργέα, καὶ  
σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι  
πατρί τε θυμὸν ἰάναιεν κόρα τ' ἔγ-  
χειβρόμῳ<sup>1</sup>.
- Ἐπὶ μὰν βαίνει τι καὶ κ', τ. λ.  
καὶ τοι γὰρ αἰθούσας ἔχοντες  
σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὐ-  
τεῦξαν δ' ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς  
ἄλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει. κείνοισι μὲν ξαν-  
θὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν  
πολὺν ὕσε χρυσὸν, αὐτὰ  
δέ σφισιν ὤπασε τέχναν  
πᾶσαν ἐπιχθονίῳ  
Γλαυκῶπις ἀριστοπόνοισι χερσὶ κρατείν.  
ἔργα δὲ ζωῶσιν ἐρπόν-  
τεσσι θ' ὅμοια κέλευθοι  
φέρων. ἦν δὲ κλέος  
βαθύ· δαέντι δὲ καὶ σοφία  
μείζων ἄδολος τελέθει<sup>m</sup>.

ii. Ἄπυρα δὲ μέχρι νῦν οἱ Ῥόδιοι θύουσιν ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἀρχῆς τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ . . . οὐ μόνον δὲ Ῥόδιοι ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς χρῶνται ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι<sup>n</sup>—Ἀνδρωθεῖσι δὲ τοῖς Ἡλιάδαις εἰπεῖν τὸν Ἥλιον, ὅτι οὔτινες ἂν Ἀθηνᾷ θύσωσι πρῶτοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἔξουσι τὴν θεόν. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ διασαφῆσαι λέγεται τοῖς τὴν Ἀττικὴν κατοικοῦσι. διὸ καὶ φασὶ τοὺς μὲν Ἡλιάδας διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιλαθομένους ἐνεγκεῖν πῦρ ἐπιθεῖναι προθύματα· τὸν δὲ τότε βασιλεύοντα τῶν Ἀθηναίων Κέκροπα ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς θῆσαι ὕστερον. διόπερ φασὶ διαμένειν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τὸ κατὰ τὴν θυσίαν ἴδιον ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ, καὶ τὴν θεὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καθιδρῦσθαι. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἀρχαιολογούμενων παρὰ Ῥοδίους οὕτω τινὲς μυθολογοῦσιν, ἐν οἷς ἐστὶ καὶ Ζήνων ὁ τὰ περὶ ταύτης συνταξάμενος<sup>o</sup>—Καὶ θύουσιν ἤδη τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ δήμοι δύο ἐπὶ δυοῖν ἱεροπόλεων, Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ῥόδιοι. γῆ καὶ θαλάττη, καὶ ἀνθρωποῖ

<sup>1</sup> Pindar, Olymp. vii. 71.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. 82.

<sup>n</sup> Scholia vetera, ad vers. 86.

<sup>o</sup> Diodor. Sic. v. 56.

γηγενεῖς, οἱ μὲν ἄπυρα ἱερά καὶ ἀτελῆ, ὁ δὲ Ἀθήνησι δῆμος πῦρ ἔχει καὶ κνίσσας ἱερῶν<sup>1</sup>.

i. The preceding fable, curious as it is, and hitherto unexplained, was evidently invented to account for a seeming inconsistency between the reason of things and the matter of fact; viz. that the recognition of the divinity of Athena was as old in Rhodes as in Attica, and yet that Attica, not Rhodes, was sacred to her. And it answers this purpose by explaining that, through an accidental oversight on the part of the Rhodians, the Athenians were the first, if not to recognise the divinity of the goddess, yet to acknowledge it, and to do honour to it, by the first complete and perfect sacrifice.

ii. Some things in the preceding accounts may be set aside at once; as, for instance, the supposed coincidence of this contest between the people of Attica and the people of Rhodes, which should be the first to do honour to Athena, with the time of the Heliadæ at Rhodes and that of Kæcrops in Attica. The contest between Athena and Posidon for the possession of Attica was dated in the time of Kæcrops too<sup>9</sup>; and that is sufficient to explain why this contest between Rhodes and Attica for the possession of Athena herself should have been dated in his time also. Not to mention that the Heliadæ, supposed to have been his contemporaries and his competitors in this contest, were the first race of men, according to the Rhodian tradition, which occupied Rhodes after the Flood, and Kæcrops, according to the Attic tradition, was the link of connection between the world before and the world after the Flood<sup>r</sup>.

iii. The remainder of the fable in substance amounts to *this*: That the recognition of the divinity of Athena after her birth took place in Rhodes as soon as in Attica, but that the first proper act of religious homage to the new-born goddess, owing to an accidental mistake, was later in Rhodes than in Attica; and therefore Attica, not Rhodes, became thenceforward the peculiar country of Athena. And for thus much of the fable, there is no reason why we may not sup-

<sup>p</sup> Philostratus, *Icones*, ii. 823 B. Ἀθηναῖς *Foval*.

<sup>9</sup> See *supra*, Vol. iv. 122 sqq.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* 126.



pose there was some foundation in the matter of fact; for the distinction itself, that Attica and not Rhodes both was and had been from the first the favoured country of Athena, is certain: and the fable does no more than assign a reason, in its own way, for that distinction.

iv. In order then to the explanation of this historical foundation; the first thing necessary is the date of the colony to Rhodes under Tlepolemus. Tlepolemus was one of the heroes of Troy; and we have often had occasion to remark that the age of Homer's heroes, in the last year of the war, was more or less the same (with some few exceptions), viz. from 40 to 55. The Trojan expedition began to be set on foot B.C. 1200; but actually set sail only in B.C. 1190: and Tlepolemus must have been settled at Rhodes considerably before that time at least. Let us assume then that he was not more than fifty-five in the last year of the siege, B.C. 1181, when he was killed by Sarpedon, nor than forty-five in the first, B.C. 1190: and consequently that he was born about B.C. 1235.

There is no allusion to Hercules his father, as still alive, when he was obliged to retire from his native country after the death of Likymnius; and Hercules, as we hope to see hereafter, must have been born about B.C. 1260, and must have died about B.C. 1208 or 1209. It must therefore have been later than B.C. 1208. It is clear too from the same account that he himself was arrived at man's estate before the same event, and therefore that it could scarcely have happened before he was 20 or 30 years of age. It is clear also that there were grandsons as well as sons of Hercules, already grown up, at the time of the event; and there could not have been grandsons as well as sons of Hercules, arrived at man's estate, (i. e. twenty years of age at least.) in less than 50 or 60 years after his own birth, B.C. 1260: on which principle, the actual date of the migration of Tlepolemus from Argos to Rhodes could not have been earlier than B.C. 1205 or 1206: but it might have been about that time, when Tlepolemus himself must have been 30 years of age, i. e. old enough to take the lead of a colony to a distant quarter; and sixteen years before the commencement of the siege of Troy, B.C. 1190, when he would be only forty-six:

by which time too the colony planted in Rhodes might already have taken root, and increased in numbers so far as to be able to send out a contingent to the assistance of the rest of the Greeks before Troy.

v. Now though the Athena of the Greeks, as the same with the Ὀγκαία of Cadmus, must have been as old among them as the coming of Cadmus, and as the same with the Isis of the daughters of Danaus must have been as old as the coming of Danaus\*, and as the same with the Neith of Erichthonius must have been as old as the coming of Erichthonius; yet as the daughter of Zeus, as the Τριτογένεια or Τριτογενής, adopted into the family of the Olympic gods and goddesses, she could not have been older<sup>s</sup> than B. C. 1260, even in Crete; and in reality not even there much older than B. C. 1206—the date of the *συννοικισμός* of Athens, and

\* The best explanation of the tradition that the worship of the Grecian Athena was introduced into Lindus, and the oldest temple to her was founded there, by Danaus, and the first sacrifice was offered to her there by the daughters of Danaus, would be the fact that Danaus and his daughters, on their way from Egypt to Greece, stopped at Rhodes, and possibly intended at first to have settled there: for if they brought the Isia with them from Egypt, they must have brought the Egyptian Isis also, and would introduce her worship into Rhodes as much as into the Peloponnese. This tradition is clearly recognised in the Parian Chronicle, Epochæ ix: and in Diodorus, v. 58: Κατὰ δὲ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους Δαναὸς ἔφυγεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετὰ θυγατέρων· καταπλεύσας δὲ τῆς Ῥοδίας εἰς Λίνδον, καὶ προσδεχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων, ἰδρύσατο τῆς Ἀθηναῖς ἱερὸν, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς θεοῦ καθιέρωσεν. That there was an ancient statue of Athena at Lindus, attributed to Danaus, appears from an epigram of Callimachus, restored by Bentley as follows:

Οὐπω Σκέλμιος ἔργον εὐξοον ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τεθμοῦ  
 δηναίου γλαφάνῳ ἄξιοος ἦσθα σάνις.  
 ὦδε γὰρ ἰδρύνοντο θεοὺς τότε· καὶ γὰρ Ἀθήνης  
 ἐν Λίνδῳ Δαναὸς κίον' ἔθηκεν ἔδος.

Epigr. cv. vol. i. 478.

That the Egyptians were aware of a close connection between this Lindian Athena and their own Neith or Isis, may be inferred from what Herodotus relates of the Thorax dedicated to her there by Amasis: ii. 182: iii. 47. Tradition adds that some of the daughters of Danaus were the first priestesses of this Athena at Lindus; and that three of them (as we have seen) died and were buried at Lindus, before the rest with their father migrated to Argos.

\* Supra, Vol. iv. 137 sqq.

of the institution of the Panathenæa of Theseus. Let us therefore be allowed to assume that the recognition of the Hellenic Athena, in this capacity, in Crete, the *συννοικισμὸς* of Athens and the Panathenæic institution of Theseus, and the migration of the colony under Tlepolemus from the Peloponnese to Rhodes, all took place about the same time—the two latter very possibly in the same year, B. C. 1206, the former not long before that year. We should have in these assumptions every thing necessary to account for the fable relating to the contest in the recognition of the divinity of Athena between Attica and Rhodes, which must have been invented sometime or other afterwards; and why, with little difference in the actual time of the recognition, the palm of priority in it nevertheless was to be assigned to Attica.

For it has been seen from the history of the Panathenæic institution itself<sup>t</sup>, that it was known and believed that the birthday of the Hellenic Athena herself was that of the Egyptian Isis-Sothis, the heliacal rising of Sirius<sup>v</sup>; properly indeed for the latitude of Heliopolis or Memphis in Egypt—but still the heliacal rising of Sirius. The heliacal rising of a given star, as astronomers are aware, is a phenomenon which must vary for different latitudes; so that a difference of 1° and a little more in excess or defect in latitude may be generally assumed to make a difference of one day in excess or defect, in the date of a given phenomenon of this kind\*. And the latitude of Lindus in Rhodes having been seven or eight degrees more to the north than that of Heliopolis in Egypt, the stated date of that kind for the latitude of Heliopolis would be seven days later for that of Lindus. On this principle the stated date of the heliacal rising of Sirius being July 20 for the latitude of Memphis, it would be July 27 for that of Lindus\*.

\* There was but little difference between the latitude of Lindus in Rhodes, and that of the city so called, in after-times; and the Greek astronomers themselves (Hipparchus and Geminus) recognise this difference of seven days between the heliacal rising of Sirius for the latitude of Memphis, and that of Rhodes, respectively, the difference of July 20 and 27. See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 17.

<sup>t</sup> Vol. iv. 52 sqq. : 129 sqq.

<sup>v</sup> Cf. *Ibid.* 129.

<sup>x</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 69 *n.*

Here then is the secret of the difference between the first recognition of the new-born Athena, at Athens in Attica, and at Lindus in Rhodes, respectively. Both took place, or were supposed to have done so, on the birthday of the goddess herself, the heliacal rising of Sirius; but the former on the date of the rising for the latitude of Heliopolis, the latter on the date of the rising for the latitude of Lindus: the former consequently seven days before the latter. The first sacrifice to Athena at Athens was performed on July 20, the first at Lindus on July 27; the former on the stated date of the heliacal rising for the latitude of Heliopolis, the latter on the same day for the latitude of Lindus; the former consequently more truly on the birthday of Athena herself, if she came originally from Egypt—the latter more truly on the birthday of a Lindian Athena, of one who was born in Rhodes and not in Egypt. The difference in time between the two acts of recognition—between the performance of the first sacrifice to the new-born goddess in the citadel of Athens and in that of Lindus respectively—was *παρὰ μικρὸν* even in this case; and so it is supposed by the fable itself to have been: but slight as it was, it made a difference of seven days between the recognition of the new-born goddess at Athens and at Lindus respectively. And Athena having thus been publicly recognised as the goddess of Athens seven days before she had yet been so as the goddess of Lindus; Athens in return must already have been acknowledged by her as the city of Athena, seven days before Lindus could possibly have been so\*.

\* The fable indeed seemed to resolve the precedence assigned to Attica, not into the prior recognition of her divinity, but into the nature of the first sacrifice offered to her, after her birth, in either case—that the one was perfect of its kind, the other was not; the difference between them consisting in *this*, that the sacrifice in Attica was a burnt-offering, that in Rhodes was not. But that this could not have been the true explanation of the resulting effect, may be inferred from what the scholiast on the same place of the ode of Pindar tells us; viz. that the absence of fire in the sacrifices to Athena was not more characteristic of her ritual in Rhodes than at Athens. If these *ἄπυρα ἱερά* denoted simply such offerings as were made without the shedding of blood, (vegetable offerings rather than animal,) it is far from improbable that such was the character of the service appointed for the Egyptian Isis, (or any object of worship the same with

## SECTION X.—On the Τελχίνες of Rhodian mythology.

i. Τοιαύτη δ' ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ποικιλία, τῶν μὲν τοὺς αὐτοὺς τοῖς Κουρήσι τοὺς Κορύβαιτας καὶ Καβεῖρους καὶ Ἰδαίους Δακτύλους καὶ Τελχίνας ἀποφαινούτων· τῶν δὲ συγγενεῖς ἀλλήλων, καὶ μικρὰς τινας αὐτῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰς διαστελλομένων·—Οἱ δὲ Τελχίνων ἐν Ῥόδῳ ἐννέα ὄντων τοὺς Ῥέα συνακολουθήσαιτας εἰς Κρήτην, καὶ τὸν Δία κουροτροφήσαιτας, Κουρήτας ὀνομασθήναι· Κορύβαιτα δὲ τούτων ἑταῖροι· Ἱεροπύτης ὄντα κτίστην κ', τ. λ.<sup>z</sup>—Ἐκαλείτο δ' ἡ Ῥόδος πρότερον Ὀφιοῦσσα καὶ Σταδία, εἶτα Τελχίνις, ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκησάντων Τελχίνων τὴν νῆσον· οὗς οἱ μὲν βασκάνους φασὶ καὶ γόητας, θείῳ καταρραίνονται τὸ τῆς στυγῶς ὕδωρ, ζῶων τε καὶ φυτῶν ὀλέθρου χάριν· οἱ δὲ τέχναις διαφέροντας τοῦναντίον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιτέχνων βασκαίθηται, καὶ τῆς δυσφημίας τυχεῖν ταύτης· ἐλθεῖν δ' ἐκ Κρήτης εἰς Κύπρον πρῶτον, εἶτ' εἰς Ῥόδον· πρῶτους δ' ἐργάσασθαι σιδήρον τε καὶ χαλκόν· καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν ἄρπην τῷ Κρόνῳ δημιουργῆσαι<sup>a</sup>—Ἐκλήθη δὲ ποτε, φασὶν, Ὀφιοῦσα, εἶτα Τελχίνις, διὰ τοὺς ἐκ Κρήτης Τελχίνας οἰκήσαιτας ἐκεῖ, ἀνδρας γόητας καὶ βασκάνους. καίτοι τινὲς μάτην δυσφημηθῆναι τούτους φασί· βασκαίθηται γὰρ μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιτέχνων αὐτοὺς, ἀρίστους ὑπάρξαντας ἐργάτας χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου, οἳ καὶ τὴν ἄρπην τῷ Κρόνῳ ἐδημιούγησαν<sup>b</sup>—And as we may add, the Trident of Posidon—

<sup>a</sup> Ἡ ὡς ταπρώτιστα μέγας θεὸς οὔρεα θείων  
 ἄορι τριγλωχίνι, τό οἱ Τελχίνες ἔτευξαν,  
 νήσους εἰναλίας εἰργάζετο<sup>c</sup>—

ii. Τὴν δὲ νῆσον τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Ῥόδον πρῶτοι κατώκησαν οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι Τελχίνες. οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν υἱοὶ μὲν Θαλάσσης, ὡς ὁ μῦθος παραδέδωκε· μυθολογοῦνται δὲ μετὰ Καφείρας τῆς Ὀκκαιοῦ θυγατρὸς ἐκθρέψαι Ποσειδῶνα, Ῥέας αὐτοῖς παρακαταθήμενης τὸ βρέφος. γενέσθαι δ' αὐτοὺς καὶ τεχνῶν τινῶν εὔρετὰς, καὶ ἄλλα τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον χρησίμων εἰσηγήσασθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,

Isis, only under a different name,) every where—owing to the same common conviction, that nothing was less becoming the great mother of all living beings—animal as well as vegetable—than the shedding of blood. The true explanation of the distinction is no doubt that which we have assigned, in the dates of these first sacrifices; July 20 and July 27 respectively.

<sup>z</sup> Strabo, x. 3. 355 a.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 365 a.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. xiv. 2. 196 b.

<sup>b</sup> Eustathius, ad Dionys. Perieg. 504.

<sup>c</sup> Callimachus, in Delum, 30.

ἀγάματά τε θεῶν πρότοι κατασκευάσασθαι λέγονται, καὶ τινα τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀφιδρυμάτων ἀπ' ἐκείνων ἐπωνομάσθαι. παρὰ μὲν γὰρ Λιυδίοις Ἐπόλλωνα Τελχίνιον προσαγορευθῆναι, παρὰ δὲ Ἰαλυσίοις Ἦραν καὶ νύμφας Τελχινίας, παρὰ δὲ Καμειρεῦσιν Ἦραν Τελχινίαν. λέγονται δ' οὗτοι καὶ γόητες γεγονέναι, καὶ παράγειν, ὅτε βούλουτο, νέφη τε καὶ ὄμβρους καὶ χαλάζας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ χιόνα ἐφέλκεσθαι ... ἀλλάττειν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἰδίας μορφὰς, καὶ εἶναι φθονεροὺς ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν τεχνῶν<sup>d</sup>—Χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον προαισθημένους τοὺς Τελχίνας τὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι κατακλυσμὸν ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν νῆσον καὶ διασπαρῆναι. Λύκον δ' ἐκ τούτων<sup>e</sup>, παραγενόμενον εἰς τὴν Λύκιαν, Ἐπόλλωνος Λυκίου ἱερὸν ἰδρύσασθαι παρὰ τὸν Ξάνθον ποταμόν. τοῦ δὲ κατακλυσμοῦ γενομένου τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους διαφθαρῆναι κ', τ. λ.<sup>f</sup>

iii. Ἐκλήθη δὲ ποτε (ἢ Σικυῶν) καὶ Τελχινία, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀδομένους Τελχίνας καὶ αὐτόθι οἰκῆσαι<sup>g</sup>—Ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου θέλγειν οἱ Τελχίνες, δηλοῦσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ, παρ' οἷς καὶ Θεελγίνες οἱ αὐτοὶ λέγονται. ἐν γοῦν ῥητορικῷ λεξικῷ κατὰ στοιχείου προΐοντι γράφεται Θεελγίνες, γόητες, φαρμακοί—Θεελγίνες<sup>i</sup>. οἱ Τελχίνες, γόητες πανοῦργοι φαρμακευταί—Τελχίνες<sup>k</sup>. πονηροὶ δαίμονες, φθονεροὶ, βάσκανοι—Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου θέλγειν καὶ Τελχίνας, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ ἐρρέθη, πλάττουσιν οἱ μῦθοι, δαίμονιός τινος κακοποιοῦς, καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ καλῷ θέλγοντας<sup>l</sup>—Θέλγει<sup>m</sup> ... Ἐνομίδης δὲ ὁ τὰ θεῖα γράψας καὶ τοὺς Τελχίνας ἐτυμολογήσας εἶπεν ὅτι Θεελγίνες ἦσαν—Τελχίν<sup>n</sup>. οὐ μόνον ὁ ἰσχὺν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἔχων μιὰρὸς καὶ κακουργὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς νῦν Κρήτας, καὶ τὴν Κρήτην Τελχινίαν λέγουσι... λέγονται δὲ Τελχίνες οἱ φθονεροὶ καὶ ποιηροὶ καὶ βάσκανοι δαίμονες, παρὰ τὸ θέλω τὸ ἀμαυρῶ καὶ σκοτίζω, Θεελγίνες τινες ὄντες, ἢ παρὰ τὸ θέλγειν καὶ ἀπατᾶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους—Τελχίνες<sup>o</sup>. βάσκανοι, γόητες, φθονεροὶ, ἢ παρὰ τὴν τῆξιν, ἢ παρὰ τὸ θέλγειν—Μύλας<sup>p</sup>. εἰς τῶν Τελχίνων, ὅς τὰ ἐν Καμειρῷ ἱερὰ Μυλαντείων ἰδρύσατο—Τέλχανος<sup>q</sup> (Τελχίνιος). ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Κρισίῳ (Κρησίῳ)—Καὶ ἡ Κρήτη Τελχινία ἐλέγετο, καὶ

<sup>d</sup> Diod. Sic. v. 55.

<sup>e</sup> Cf. Hesychius, Λύκος ... καὶ εἰς τῶν Τελχίνων. Also Nonnus, Dionysiaca, xiv. 36-39, where the names of three are enumerated, Λύκος Κέλμης Δαμναμενεύς. See also the Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. i. 1126 Κέλμης in Nonnus, supra, page 266, note, was Σκέλμης in Callimachus.

<sup>f</sup> Diod. v. 56.

<sup>g</sup> Eustathius, ad Iliad. B. 572. 291.

<sup>28.</sup> cf. Steph. Byz. in Τελχίς.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. ad Odys. A. 54. 1391. 11.

<sup>i</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>k</sup> Photii Lex. cf. Suidas in voce.

<sup>l</sup> Eustathius, ad Iliad. N. 435. 941. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Etym. Magn.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

οἱ Κρήτες Τελχίνες<sup>r</sup>—Ἰγνητες<sup>s</sup>· οὕτως ὠνομάζοντο οἱ μετὰ τοὺς Τελχίνας ἐποικήσαντες τὴν Ῥόδον—Γιγῆς· ἔθνος οἰκῆσαν τὴν Ῥόδον, ἔνθεν καὶ Γυήτες οἱ ἰθαγενεῖς. λέγεται δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἰ<sup>v</sup> Ἰγνητες<sup>t</sup>—Καὶ Σιμμάς ὁ Ῥόδιος·

<sup>v</sup> Ἄμμας

<sup>v</sup> Ἰγνήτων καὶ Τελχίνων ἔφθον ἡ ἄλυκῆ ζάψ.

(καλεῖται δ' οὕτως, sc. ζάψ, ἢ θάλασσα.)<sup>v</sup>—Ἀρταίη δαίμων<sup>s</sup>· ἡ Ῥέα οὕτω λέγεται, διότι ἐναντία τοῖς Τελχίσι ἐγένετο—Καὶ μάλιστα ὁ πικρὸς Λαυκίας Τελχίνος ἦν μοι βασκαίων βαρύτερος<sup>y</sup>.

iv. Καὶ Ἀθηναῖς ἐν Τευμησσῶ Τελχινίας ἐστὶν ἱερὸν, ἄγαλμα οὐκ ἔχον· ἐς δὲ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν αὐτῆς ἐστὶν εἰκάζειν ὡς τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ ποτὲ οἰκησάντων Τελχίνων ἀφικομένη μοῖρα ἐς Βοιωτοὺς ἱερὸν ἰδρύσατο Ἀθηναῖς Τελχινίας<sup>z</sup>—Ἄπις (son of Phoroneus) ... ὀνομάσας ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν Πελοπόννησον Ἀπίαν, ὑπὸ Θελεξίου καὶ Τελχίνος ἐπιβουλευθεῖς, ἄπαις ἀπέθανε, καὶ νομισθεὶς θεὸς ἐκλήθη Σάραπις<sup>a</sup>—Τελχίνες ἐκπεσόντες Πελοποννήσου Ῥόδον ἔκκησαν νῆσον τὴν καλουμένην Ὀφιοῦσσαν<sup>b</sup>—Telchines victi Rhodum condiderunt, quæ prius Ophiussa vocabatur<sup>c</sup>—Telchines ... Rhodum insulam quæ Ophiussa antea vocabatur, quasi tutam possessionem ceperunt<sup>d</sup>—Ante annos conditæ urbis MLXX (B. C. 1823) Telchines et Carpathii pernicax prælium adversus Phoroneum... gesserunt<sup>e</sup>. And sometime after that, their migration to Rhodes, 30 years before the flood of Ogyges<sup>e</sup>—Telchines et Caryatæ adversum Phoroneum et Parrhasios instituunt bellum<sup>f</sup>.

v. Λέγει δὲ ὁ Γεωγράφος καὶ ὅτι Τελχίνες ἐννέα ἐν Ῥόδῳ τῇ Ῥέα συνακολουθήσαντες εἰς Κρήτην, καὶ Δία κουροτροφήσαντες, Κουρήτες ὠνομάσθησαν. πολὺς δὲ ὁ περὶ Τελχίνων λόγος καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς. εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ καὶ Κρήτας αὐτοὺς φασι, καὶ Θεελγίνας ὀνομάζουσι παρὰ τὸ θέλγειν, καὶ γόητας εἶναι φασι καὶ φαρμακεῖς, καὶ δύο γένη αὐτῶν εἶναι, τὸ μὲν βάνουσον καὶ χειρωνακτικόν, τὸ δὲ λυμαντήριον τῶν καλῶν, ἢ γγον τῶν εὐμόρφων. καὶ οἱ μὲν θαλάσσης παῖδας αὐτοὺς εἶναι, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Ἀκταίωνος κυνῶν

<sup>r</sup> Steph. Byz. Τελχίς.

<sup>s</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>t</sup> Steph. Byz. Γιγῆς. It seems to be a contraction for Γιγηνῆς, Γιγῆς.

<sup>v</sup> Clemens Alex. Strom. v. viii. § 48.

pag. 35. l. 11.

<sup>x</sup> Apollon. Rhod. i. 1141, and the Scholia.

<sup>y</sup> Alkiphron, Epp. i. xii. p. 19.

<sup>z</sup> Pausanias, ix. xix. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Apollodorus, Biblioth. ii. i. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Syncellus, 282. 3: Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ad ann. 276.

<sup>c</sup> Jerome, Thes. Temp. ad ann. 276.

<sup>d</sup> Orosius, i. 7.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 45.

<sup>f</sup> Euseb. Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 83. ad ann. 229, in the 19th of Phoroneus, 1011 years before Olym. i. 1, i. e. B. C. 1787. cf. Syncellus, 238. 12.

μεταμορφωθῆναι εἰς ἀνθρώπους· τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀγρίως ἔχειν, ὡς καὶ μυθεύεσθαι σκηπητοὺς ἀφιέναι, καὶ ποτήριον δοκεῖν ἔχειν ἐν ᾧ ρίζας κυκῶντες ἐφάρμασσον γοητευτικῶς. ἀνατίθεται δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ κατασκευὴ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Κρόνον ἄρπης, ἣ τὸν πατέρα Οὐρανὸν εὐνούχισε. καὶ ἀγαματοποιῶν δὲ εὐρεῖν ἐδόκουν καὶ μέταλλα, καὶ ἀμφίβιοι εἶναι, καὶ ἕξαλλοι ταῖς μορφαῖς, ὡς ἐμφερεῖς τὰ μὲν δαίμοσι τὰ δὲ ἀνθρώποις τὰ δὲ ἰχθύσι τὰ δὲ ὄφεσι. μῦθος δὲ καὶ ἄχειρας ἐνίουσ αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ ἄποδας, καὶ ἀνάμεσον τῶν δακτύλων δέρματα ἔχειν κατὰ χῆνας. ἦσαν δὲ, φασὶ, καὶ γλανκωποὶ καὶ μελανόφρυνες. οἱ δὲ εἰπόντες τρεῖς αὐτοὺς εἶναι ὀνόματα κομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ χαλκόν, ὁμωνύμως ὕλη ἣν ἕκαστος εὔρε. κατομβρηθέντες δὲ, φασὶν, ὑπὸ Διὸς ἢ τοξευθέντες ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος ὤλοντο. ἱστορεῖται δὲ καὶ ἡ Ῥόδος ἀπ' αὐτῶν Τελχινία καλεῖσθαι. ἡ δὲ παροιμία τοὺς φθοιεροὺς καὶ ψογεροὺς Τελχίννας ... καλεῖ. Στησίχορος δὲ, φασὶ, τὰς κῆρας καὶ τὰς σκοτώσεις Τελχίννας προσηγόρευσε §—

Phœbeamque Rhodon et Ialysios Telchinas,  
 Quorum oculos ipso vitiantes omnia visu  
 Jupiter exosus fraternis subdidit undis<sup>h</sup>.

It might well be observed by Eustathius that the singular race of beings, described in the preceding accounts, had been an object of much curiosity, and had given occasion to many conjectures. The substance of those explanations however, we may presume, is contained in these statements; and assuming that to have been the case, we shall proceed to make some remarks upon them.

i. Though these Telchines appear to have been more closely connected in the apprehension of antiquity with the island of Rhodes, than with any other quarter; yet it must be evident from these accounts that they were not supposed to have been confined to Rhodes. They are recognised as some time or other inhabitants of Crete, of Cyprus, of the Peloponnese, and of Bœotia, before their first appearance in Rhodes; from which it may be inferred that the light in which they were most generally regarded must have been that of the representatives, in some sense or other, of a former race of beings, which in the order of time and place

§ Eustathius ad Iliad. I. 525. 771. 56.

<sup>h</sup> Ovid, Metam. vii. 365. cf. Lactantius, ad Thebaid. ii. 274.



had preceded any other, known to have afterwards occupied the same parts of the earth; and in that respect resembling the Pelasgi of Greek tradition, and the Aborigines of Italian.

ii. Some particulars in these accounts may be set aside; such, for instance, as profess to assign these Telchines a time, and to define both the cause and the date of their migration to Rhodes, from any other quarter: as, for example, from the Peloponnese, in consequence of their war with Phoroneus. We may set aside also those accounts which made them contemporaries of Kronos and Rhea, and the same with the Corybantes and the Curetes. All this was easy to be imagined, especially after the rise of the national fable in Rhodes, analogous to that in Crete, and that in Cyprus. The Cretan origin of this addition to the traditional account of the Telchines is plainly implied in the course which it took, to bring them into Rhodes; supposing them to have migrated first of all from Crete, with Rhea, to Cyprus, and then from Cyprus to Rhodes. These two fables, the Cretan of Cronos and Rhea, and the Cypriot one of Aphrodite and Adonis, were synchronous in their origin; and the Rhodian one of Helios and Rhodos, though later than both, was connected with each, especially with the latter. And as the effect of this circumstantial addition to the history of the Telchines was merely to connect both the national fable of Cyprus and that of Rhodes with the Cretan one of the same kind, we may presume such was the end intended by it; and consequently that it was most probably invented in Crete.

iii. But even after allowance has been made for such additions as these, certain particulars, attested more or less by all the preceding accounts, will still remain, for distrusting which, as professing to be the real traditional representation of these Telchines, and the real opinion and belief of antiquity concerning them, no good reason, so far as we know, is discoverable. And these we shall proceed to state.

i. These Telchines, though an extraordinary race of men, and one which at first sight might be taken for something different from human, were after all a particular class of the same kind of beings in general, which were known or supposed

to have lived and died on the face of the earth; differing from all others in that respect only in the order of time—in having preceded the rest, and having disappeared to make way for the rest—in the occupation of the same parts of the earth. ii. The origin of these Telchines was not different from that of the rest of mankind. The rest of mankind, in the common belief of antiquity, came into existence out of chaos, out of the sea, out of water; and so did these Telchines, for these too were the children of the sea. iii. These Telchines, in respect to their disposition, i.e. their moral constitution, agreed with the rest of mankind, in being neither absolutely good, nor yet unmixedly evil; but partly the one and partly the other, yet with a bias to evil rather than good: a bias which in their case shewed itself in an inclination to do evil to other things without provocation; and particularly in a certain antipathy to the young and beautiful, which impelled them to seek their destruction. iv. These Telchines were eminently distinguished by their ingenuity and their powers of invention. They were the discoverers of the handicraft and mechanical arts, especially the art of metallurgy, the working in gold, silver, or brass; and not only of the necessary or useful arts, but of the elegant and ornamental—such for instance as the art of the sculptor—the practice of which too was attributed to them. v. These Telchines disappeared at last, not in the ordinary manner in which one race of men after another disappears from the face of the earth, but through an express interposition of the gods, to whom for some reason or other they had become obnoxious; i. e. either through the arrows of Apollo, or through a deluge. vi. These Telchines were nine in number: for that appears to have been the genuine tradition concerning them, and not that they were merely three, the number simply of those among them who were supposed to have discovered the art of working in the hard metals, gold, silver, and brass, and each to have derived his name in particular from one of these subjects of their art in common.

Laying therefore these different intimations together, we can come only to one conclusion; viz. that if this traditionary order of beings represented any actual race of mankind, it must have been one which had once an actual existence on

the face of the earth, and yet had some time or other, and for some reason or other, been all swept away by the waters of a deluge. That is, though an actual race of the former inhabitants of the earth, it was an antediluvian one.

Now, as the readers of Scripture must be aware, there were two classes of the antediluvian possessors of the earth, which had a common origin indeed, and yet from the first were discriminated and kept distinct; the descendants of Adam through Cain, and the descendants of Adam through Seth. Of these the latter had still their representatives in the post-diluvian world, but the former had passed away with the deluge. The question however is, Whether the memory of this one of the two great divisions of mankind before the deluge, passed away with them also? or Whether the successors of the other division, the surviving representatives of the antediluvian world, still retained the recollection at least of the other great branch of the human family, which had divided the possession of the earth with their own progenitors, down to the flood? for if they did, then, as every one must admit, it might be expected *a priori* we should find it embodied in some of the traditions of the postdiluvian world; more or less different from the truth indeed, yet retaining the general features and outlines of the truth.

And this in our opinion is the true explanation of this Rhodian fable of the Telchines. It is the traditionary history of the antediluvian race of mankind, in that one of its principal divisions, which we have learnt from Scripture to discriminate as the line of Cain, in contradistinction to that of Seth. The intelligent reader, as soon as this clue is put into his hands, cannot fail to perceive how competent it is to explain the above accounts in their most important circumstances, and to reduce these Telchines from a merely imaginary and impossible class of beings, to a real and historical one, differing from any other at present only in the circumstance of their having lived before the flood.

In the first place, with respect to the origin of these Telchines, it is consistent with the Scriptural account of the origin of mankind, that even these Telchines, in the opinion of antiquity, came into existence out of the sea; that being the Scriptural account of the state of the earth, as nothing but a

sea, before the creation of the first man. Secondly, with respect to the moral character and disposition of these Τελχίνες; the first act of bloodshed, the first violent taking away of life, the first murder among mankind, was the doing of Cain, the founder, as we are supposing, of the line of the Τελχίνες; and the subject of his violence was Abel, his younger brother, and his motive to it, as we collect it from Scripture, was envy and jealousy of his brother. It is scarcely conceivable that the first instance of homicide, and under such remarkable circumstances as these, would not be long remembered in the antediluvian world; and would not even survive the flood: in which case the memory of Cain, and of the descendants of Cain, it is easy to see, might go down to posterity in the postdiluvian world, stamped with the peculiar mark which this tradition appears to have handed down as characteristic of the Τελχίνες, that of a natural feeling of ill-will towards the καλοὶ, or εὐμορφοί, to which the young and virtuous Abel had fallen a victim in the first instance.

Thirdly, though these Τελχίνες were really a particular race of men, yet in some of the preceding accounts they appear to be represented as a kind of δαίμονες, an order of beings between gods and men. And if tradition had preserved in the postdiluvian world any recollection of those giants of Scripture, or those men of renown, the offspring of angels and the daughters of men, before the flood, it would not be extraordinary to find the Τελχίνες of this postdiluvian tradition identified with them, in some of the accounts relating to them.

Fourthly, tradition appears to have uniformly attributed to these Τελχίνες a peculiar talent for the mechanical arts and inventions. They were eminently a γένος βάνανσον, and χειρωνακτικόν. In particular, it seems to have been remembered concerning them everywhere, that they taught men the use of the metals, and the art of working in the metals. Now this must do much to identify them with the descendants of Cain, of whom Scripture, *mutatis mutandis*, has recorded the same things; that these too were the inventors of the useful arts, and of the elegant, as well as the useful; that one was the father of those who dwelt in tents, the in-

ventor, i. e. of everything necessary to the Nomadic Life; another was the father of those who handled the harp and the organ, i. e. the inventor of musical instruments; another was the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron, and by parity of reason, we may presume, in gold and silver—the most characteristic and the best authenticated fact in the traditionary history of the Telchines also—from which it does not seem possible to draw any other conclusion, than that these Telchines and the descendants of Cain, as both the authors of the very same mechanical arts and inventions, must have been the same.

Fifthly, these Telchines were nine in number; and the number of the antediluvian patriarchs, in the line of Cain, according to Scripture<sup>i</sup>, was nine also, including Cain himself; Cain, Enoch, Irad, Methusael, Lamech, Jubal, Tubal, and Tubal-cain. Sixthly, these Telchines perished at last all at once, through an express interposition of the gods, the instrument of which was a deluge: and so did the descendants of Cain, in the antediluvian world, by the waters of the flood.

Lastly, the name of Τελχίνες, applied by tradition to this peculiar race, may be shewn to confirm our explanation; and, on etymological principles, to denote neither more nor less than the descendants of Cain. For, i. the name itself is evidently a compound one; the two elements of which are Τελ and χιν, forming together Τελχίν in the singular, and Τελχίνες in the plural. ii. It is evident that neither the word so compounded, nor the elements of which it is composed, are Greek; and therefore that both must have been imported into the Greek language from some other. iii. In the Hebrew or Phœnician (on the opposite coast to Rhodes), Tel was the word for *Deu* in English, δρόσος in Greek; and δρόσος in Greek was used metaphorically for the young of any animal. In Homer ἐέρση, which means the same thing as δρόσος, is regularly applied to the young of the sheep; and by Æschylus δρόσος is applied to the young of all animals indiscriminately. And though it must be admitted that Tel is not found so applied, at least in the Bible: yet in the cognate language of Syria Teleh was actually used for a child or an

<sup>i</sup> Genesis iv. 17–22.

infant<sup>k</sup>: and the same word must have passed into Greek, in much the same sense, in the form of *Τάλις*, a young woman; instances<sup>l</sup> of which occur in the classical writers themselves—

Τῆς μελλογάμου  
τάλιδος<sup>l</sup>—

on which the Scholiast; *Τάλις λέγεται παρ' Αἰολέουσιν ἡ ὀνομασθένεισά τινι νύμφη. Καλλίμαχος*'

Ἀντίκα τὴν τάλιν παιδί σὺν ἀμφιθαλεῖ<sup>m</sup>—

*Τάλις*<sup>n</sup>. ἡ μελλόγαμος παρθένος, καὶ κατωνομασμένη τινί. οἱ δὲ γυναῖκα γαμετήν· οἱ δὲ νύμφην. When we consider at what an early age young women were given in marriage in Greece, we shall be convinced that there could not have been much difference between *τάλις* in the sense of a young girl, and *τᾶλις* in the sense of a bride: and the *Talitha cumi* of the Gospel History<sup>o</sup> shews, in like manner, that while *Talitha* (i. e. *Teleh* or *Tel*) was actually a vernacular term in the Hebrew, as much as in the Syriac, of our Saviour's time, it was commonly so applied to a girl of eleven or twelve years of age.

The first element of this compound word then was *Tel*, in the sense of child or son. With respect to the other, *Kîn*, it is evidently the Scriptural name of Cain itself, in the Hebrew, simply written without points;—כַּיִן, in pronunciation, *Kîn*, in Greek characters, *KIN*. It is no objection that the *K*, in the actual compound form of the word in Greek, became *X*; for it must have been just as allowable to change the *K* in *Τελκῖν*, into *X* in *Τελχῖν*, as the *X* in *Χρόνος*, into *K* in *Κρόνος*, as the name of *Κρόνος*—or, as *Aristophanes* has done, to change *Xίος* into *Κεῖος*—

Οὐ Χίος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος<sup>p</sup>.

Nor could any one, who thought of deriving *Τελχῖν* from *Θεργῖν*, (as many of the grammarians of antiquity did,) object to this substitution of *Τελχῖν* for *Τελκῖν*. Meanwhile it confirms this derivation, that the *i* in *Kin*, as the name of Cain, was naturally long in the Hebrew, and the *ι* in *Kiv*, in Greek, in the last syllable of this word, was long also. The true explanation of the word therefore, as resolved into both its elements, and taking its meaning from each alike, is that of the *CHIL-*

<sup>k</sup> See Gesenius in voce.

<sup>l</sup> Sophocles, *Antigone*, 628.

<sup>m</sup> *Fragn. ccc.*

<sup>n</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>o</sup> Mark v. 41. cf. Luke viii. 54.

<sup>p</sup> *Ranae*, 970.

DREN of CAIN. This word Τελαχίτες is neither more nor less than a patronymic, equivalent to *Καυίδαι*—so to say; the lineal descendants of the Cain of Scripture.

From these various coincidences therefore it may reasonably be inferred that if the Telchines of Rhodian mythology, represented, characterized, and denominated as they are, denoted an actual race of men, it must have been the descendants of Cain, between the Creation and the Flood. It may consequently be justly contended that this singular fable, inexplicable as it has hitherto been considered, was founded at bottom in truth; and contained a real meaning, eminently calculated to illustrate the Scriptural account of the common origin both of the antediluvian and of the postdiluvian family of mankind. Nor is it more extraordinary *per se*, or less to have been expected *a priori*, that the existence and name of the posterity of the first man, through this one of his descendants, should have been preserved by a genuine postdiluvian tradition, than the memory and name of the first man himself, the Adam of Scripture: which nevertheless was the case, as we hope to see on a future opportunity.

With respect to the quarter from which such a tradition as this may best be supposed to have got admission into the island of Rhodes; though in strictness we are not bound to answer that further question, (which has nothing to do with the fact of the tradition itself,) yet, as the name of the Telchines so evidently came from the opposite coast of Phœnicia, we should be of opinion, that the traditions connected with it came from the same quarter also: and in that case, through the Phœnician settlers in the island, to whom, as the first of the number, we had occasion to allude before<sup>1</sup>. And although, from the proximity of Phœnicia to Judæa, and the intercourse which there must have been between the Phœnicians and the people of Israel, it might be conjectured that these traditions, even among the Phœnicians, were to be ultimately traced to the Hebrew Scriptures; yet in reality they differed too much in their circumstances from the Scriptural account of the same things, to allow us to suppose they could have been derived from Revelation, through the Jews. They must be regarded as the antediluvian history

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, 232 n.

perpetuated, in some manner or other, without the light of Scripture; and yet agreeably to the written accounts of the same things in Scripture, in substance at least—and therefore very proper to be appealed to, not indeed in confirmation of Scripture, which requires no confirmation beyond itself, but to illustrate it, and to shew, by a remarkable case in point, that between the genuine tradition of primitive antiquity, and the simple historical narrative of Scripture, there never was, nor ever will be, any contradiction.

SECTION XI.—*On the Ἡλιάδαι of Rhodian Mythology.*

- i. Βλάσπε μὲν ἐξ ἄλδος ὑγρᾶς  
 νᾶσος, ἔχει τέ μιν ὀ-  
 ξειᾶν ὁ γενέθλιος ἀκτίνων πατήρ,  
 πῦρ πνεόντων ἀρχὸς ἵππων.  
 ἔνθα Ῥόδῳ ποτὲ μιχθεὶς  
 τέκεν ἑπτὰ σοφώ-  
 τατα νοήματ' ἐπὶ προτέρων  
 ἀνδρῶν παραδεξαμένους  
 παῖδας, ὧν εἷς μὲν Κάμειρον  
 πρεσβύτατόν τε Ἴα-  
 λυσον ἔτεκεν, Δίνδον τ'. ἀπάτερθε δ' ἔχον,  
 διὰ γαίαν τρίχα δασ-  
 σάμενοι, πατρωῖαν  
 ἀστέων μοῖραν κέκληνται δέ σφιν ἔδραι τ'.

ii. Ἡλίου καὶ Ῥόδου ἐγένοντο παῖδες ζ', καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἡλεκτρύωνη<sup>s</sup>—Τρίπολιν νᾶσον<sup>t</sup>. ἔκγονοι δὲ Ἡλίου, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ πόλεις ὠνομάσθησαν, Δίνδος, Ἴηλυσοῦς, Κάμειρος, παῖδες Κερκάφου τοῦ Ἡλίου καὶ Κυδίππης τῆς Ὀχίμου θυγατρὸς. Δίδυμος δὲ φησι καὶ τετάρτην εἶναι πόλιν, τὴν νῦν Ἀχαίων καλουμένην—Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ Ἡλίου ἑπτὰ παῖδες οὗτοι Κέρκαφος, Ἀκτὶς, Μακαρεὺς, Τενάγης, Τριόπης, Φαέθων ὁ νεώτερος, Ὀχιμος<sup>v</sup>—Ἡλίου καὶ Ῥόδου (οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὴν Ἑλλάνικος καλεῖ) ἑπτὰ παῖδες γίνονται, Ὀχιμος, Κέρκαφος, Ἀκτὶς, Μακαρεὺς, Κάνδαλος, Τριόπης, Φαέθων ὁ νεώτατος, ὧν οἱ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ὀνομάζουσι Τενάγην. περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν διαφέρουσιν. οὐ πάντες γὰρ φασὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς<sup>w</sup>—Τοῦ δὲ Κερκάφου Δίνδος, Ἴηλυσοῦς, Κάμειρος<sup>x</sup>—

iii. Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Τελχίνας οἱ Ἡλιάδαι μυθεύονται κατασχεῖν τὴν νῆσον, ὧν ἔνιοι, Κερκάφου καὶ Κυδίππης γενέσθαι παῖδας τοὺς τὰς πόλεις κτίσαντας ἑπωνύμους αὐτῶν

<sup>t</sup> Pindar, Olymp. vii. 127.

<sup>s</sup> Schol. vetera, ad vers. 24.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. ad 34.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. ad vers. 131.

<sup>w</sup> Ad vers. 135.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid.



Λίνδον, Ἰηλυσσόν τε, καὶ ἀργινόνετα Κάμειρον<sup>γ</sup>—

Τὸν δὲ προρρηθέντα Λίνδον καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοὺς οὕτω γενεαλογῶσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ Ἡλίον καὶ Ῥόδον νύμφης υἱὸς Κέρκαφος, οὗ καὶ Λυσίππης Λίνδος, Ἰηλυσὸς, καὶ Κάμειρος<sup>ζ</sup>—Quartus (sol) is, quem heroicis temporibus Acantho Rhodi peperisse dicitur, (pater) Ialysi Camiri et Lindi<sup>α</sup>—Quartus Ialysi pater, quem Rhodi peperit heroicis temporibus Acantho<sup>β</sup>—Ἡλιον δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸν μῦθον ἐρασθέντα τῆς Ῥόδου, κ', τ. λ. εἶναι δὲ τοὺς ἑπτὰ υἱοὺς Ὀχιμον, Κέρκαφον, Μάκαρα, Ἀκτύια, Τευάγην, Τριόπαν, καὶ Κάνδαλον, θυγατέρα δὲ μίαν Ἠλεκτρυόνην<sup>ς</sup>.

It thus appears that in the recognition of a race, which came next to the Telchines in antiquity and in the possession of Rhodes, in their descent from the sun, and in their number, tradition even before the time of Pindar must have been uniform. And though to these seven sons of Ἥλιος, some of these accounts add a daughter also, called Ἠλεκτρυόνη, there is no proof that this daughter was known to Pindar. And though the number also of these Ἡλιάδαι in some of the same accounts is increased to ten, by the addition of three sons of one of them, whom they call Κέρκαφος; this is so clearly for the sake of the three earliest settlements of the Greeks in Rhodes, Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus, in order to derive these too from the Heliadæ—that we need not hesitate to set it down to the invention of later times. This part of the fable is contradicted by the testimony of Homer; who knew of no founder of those three cities but Tlepolemus and his followers from Argos.

The names of these Heliadæ also, as something independent of their number, we are told by the scholiast on Pindar, were so differently represented, that none can be supposed to have been handed down by any genuine and authentic tradition; like that which perpetuated the fact of their common descent from the sun, and of their common relation to the island of Rhodes, as its first and oldest inhabitants next to the Telchines, and that of their number. The fictitious character of some of these names is betrayed by their etymon itself; for instance, that of Τευάγης, from τέταγος, palus

<sup>γ</sup> Strabo, xiv. 2. 196, 197.

<sup>ζ</sup> Eustathius, ad Iliad. B. 655. 315. 26.

<sup>α</sup> Cicero, De Natura Deorum, iii. 21, 54.

<sup>β</sup> Arnobius, iv. 135.

<sup>ς</sup> Diodorus, v. 56.

a marsh; implying that this *Τενάγης* was merely the personification of the superficial state of the island itself—as it was left by the waters of the deluge: and likewise that of *Ἄκτις*, the Greek for a sunbeam, which being personified also might well have been supposed the name of one of these children of the sun. And to this *Ἄκτις* Diodorus Sic.<sup>d</sup> and Stephanus Byz.<sup>e</sup> attributed the foundation of Heliopolis in Egypt, that is, of the city of the sun; under the very natural presumption that the city of the sun could have had no founder so properly as *Ἄκτις*, the sunbeam, the son of the sun.

It would seem then that in this Rhodian fable relating to the Heliadæ, nothing can be depended upon, as expressive of the genuine tradition of antiquity concerning them, except these three things: i. That they were next to the Telchines in the order of time, and in the possession of the island of Rhodes. ii. That they were the children of the Cosmogonic Duad of the island, Helius and Rhodus. iii. That they were seven in number. The inference from the first of these facts is obvious, That as the Telchines represented the antediluvian race which inhabited Rhodes before the flood, so must these Heliadæ have represented its postdiluvian occupants and possessors. The deluge was the boundary between the two. The existence of the Telchines was terminated at the Flood, that of the Heliadæ began immediately after it. With respect to the second; that this first race of the postdiluvian possessors of the island should have been represented as the children of Helius and Rhodus, the two principles of the Cosmogonic Duad of Rhodes, was simply in unison with the assumptions and doctrines of this cosmogony itself—according to which everything in the island, both animate and inanimate, must derive its existence from the sun and the pomegranate-power in conjunction.

But with respect to their number, and why it should have been handed down from the first as neither more nor less than seven; it is difficult to account for it satisfactorily on any principle of explanation but one, that of the Hebdomadal division of Time, and the connection between that division, and not only the first but the second beginning of things,

<sup>d</sup> v. 57.

<sup>e</sup> In voce, Ἡλιούπολις.

the second *natale mundi*, as well as the first. It was well known and long remembered even in the postdiluvian world, that the present system of things was brought into being in the seven days of the Heptaëmeron, and that the *Natale Mundi* of the world before the flood, April 25, was the *feria prima* of the first Hebdomadal cycle<sup>f</sup>: and it might have been equally well remembered, that the second *Natale Mundi*, the day of the descent from the ark, in the year after the Deluge, was the *feria prima* of the Hebdomadal cycle also. The date of that day, May 16, was still remembered, as late as the time of Erichthonius and the institution of his Athenææ; and it is just as probable that this character of the day, its place and order in the first Hebdomadal cycle in the second decursus of mundane time, which so strikingly identified the second *Natale Mundi* with the first, would be long remembered also. The fact at least is certain, that May 16 was the *feria prima*, A. M. 1658, B. C. 2317, as much as April 25, A. M. 1, B. C. 4004<sup>b</sup>. It is also observable that this day, May 16, the day of the descent from the ark, was the 8th of the moon, which was new the same year on May 9; and the first week of hebdomadal time, dated from the second beginning of things, and the second lunar quarter, dated from the same epoch, were so far the same. It is far from improbable that this fact too might have been perpetuated by tradition in the postdiluvian world, as much as that of the full moon of the deluge; proof of which we saw *supra*<sup>i</sup>. And as these seven Heliadæ of the Rhodian fable were as much the children of the moon as of the sun, this renders it only so much the more probable that they were the type and impersonation of the first week of solar time in the sense of hebdomadal, and the first week of lunar, from the first quarter to the full, of the second system of things—from May 16, the day of the descent from the ark, to May 23. The reader however will judge of this explanation for himself. If true, it is important in many respects; and especially as recognising both the Hebdomadal cycle in general,

<sup>f</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 368–383. Cf. also our *Origines Kal. Ital. Prolegomena*, lxxxix–xcviii.

<sup>g</sup> See Vol. iv. 92. 128.

<sup>h</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 172.

<sup>i</sup> *Supra* 159.

and that of the Heptaëmeron, and that of the second beginning of things, in particular\*.

### CHAPTER III.

*On the Chronology of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, and the testimony to the Calendar of Rhodes, rendered by it.*

SECTION I.—*On the interest attaching to the Argonautica, as one of the few surviving Epic Poems of classical antiquity.*

Among the numerous epic poems, (all later in their composition than the Iliad and the Odyssey,) which once existed in the Greek language, and contributed, each in its turn, to the delight of contemporary readers, the Argonautica of

\* It is however to be observed that, forasmuch as the Hellenic branch of the human family, in the postdiluvian world, was certainly descended from Japheth, and the name of Japheth in connection with the well known fable of Prometheus, Pandora, and Epimetheus, was always preserved among the Greeks in the form of *Ίάπετος*; this circumstance of the number of the *Ἡλιάδαι* in particular, after all, may have been founded on the fact that the children of Japheth also, as we learn from the Hebrew Scripture, Gen. x. 2, 1 Chron. i. 5, were seven in number; though the *ο'* in both these places adds one more, which does not appear in the Hebrew, nor in the Samaritan, viz. that of Elisa; in the Hebrew a son of Javan, and a grandson of Japheth. The *Ἡλιάδαι*, as the representatives of the postdiluvian, in contradistinction to the antediluvian, race of men in general, might have been purposely represented as seven in number, because the sons of Japheth were seven also.

It is observable also that, as among these sons of Japheth, Javan appears to have been more especially the father of the Greeks, and his name too was perpetuated among them in that of *Ίάων* or *Ίων*, so, if we adopt the reading of the *ο'*—and of the Samaritan, at Gen. x. 4, and that of the Hebrew itself, 1 Chron. i. 7—the name of the fourth of the sons of Javan was Rodanim, and according to the *ο'*, the *Ῥόδιοι* or Rhodians were descended from him. But this is a very uncertain point. The true reading of this name was more probably that of the Hebrew Vulgate, Dodanim—reflected in the Hellenic tradition itself, in the very ancient name of Dodona.

Apollonius Rhodius is almost the only one which has descended to posterity. And this consideration ought to give it a peculiar interest, as being at present the sole surviving specimen of a very numerous class of productions, all belonging to the noblest order of poetry, and all written in imitation and even in emulation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; so that in the contest of excellence in the highest walk of genius, there is scarcely one of his countrymen now left to dispute the palm with Homer, except Apollonius. Time has removed every other competitor, between the author of the *Iliad* and the author of the *Argonautica*; and Proximus huic may literally be said of the latter, relatively to Homer, from his chronological position alone.

And yet though no one could think of setting the *Argonautica* on a par with the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, the second rank at least, among the poems which have anywhere aspired at excellence in the most exalted department of their art, may be assigned it. The judgment of his contemporaries placed the author in his lifetime in that constellation of genius to which they gave the name of the Poetical Pleiad—Theocritus, Nicander, Callimachus, Homerus Tragicus, Aratus, Lycophron, and Apollonius; and it is no slight testimony to the intrinsic worth, and to the numerous beauties, of the *Argonautica*, that Virgil, the most judicious imitator among the Romans of the Greek poets, has borrowed more freely from this poem than from any other of classical antiquity, so far as we know, except the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The conception of his Dido, and the description of the passion of love, which interest our feelings so much in his fourth book, were copied from the *Medea* of Apollonius; and there are many passages of the *Æneid* besides, confessedly imitated from the *Argonautica*, of which a fair and impartial comparison would show that, with all the advantage of second thoughts, Virgil has not surpassed Apollonius, nor by the beauty of the imitation made up in the copy for the defect of originality.

SECTION II.—*On the Chronology of the Argonautica in particular, and the point of view in which it is proposed to regard it.*

There is reason at least to believe that no epic poem of antiquity was ever written with greater attention to the rules of art, (those especially which Aristotle laid down and explained in his *Poetica*, before the time of Apollonius,) than the *Argonautica*. It is agreed that the first effort of the author on this subject, (whether because it was made at too early an age, before the powers of his genius had yet been fully developed or his judgment had attained to its maturity, or from whatsoever cause,) proved so signal a failure, and exposed him to so much raillery from his contemporaries, and even his own master, Callimachus, as to drive him from Alexandria into seclusion<sup>k</sup>, until he should have written his unfortunate poem over again. And it is agreed also, that in this attempt at an amended production, he succeeded to the utmost of his desire; and the second *ἔκδοσις*, as it was called, was received with as much applause, as the first had been with ridicule. Longinus himself admits that Apollonius is *ἄπρωτος*<sup>l</sup>; and though he never soars to the height of Homer, yet neither does he fall so low, as Homer sometimes does. The characteristic excellence of the *Argonautica* is a well sustained dignity, which never sinks below the just standard of elevation proper for the epic, though it seldom rises above it.

To enter however on the critical consideration of the poem would be altogether foreign to our proper purpose. We will observe only, that a composition so artificially constructed as this is allowed to have been, and so attentive to historical as well as poetical propriety in all other respects, could never have been regardless of chronology. It is the chronology of the *Argonautica* which we propose to investigate—to bring to light, and to illustrate, if possible—at present. The chronological beauties of the poem, (if we may give the name of beauty to the perfection of its chronology,) the nicety, minuteness, and consistency of its chronological details, have hitherto

<sup>k</sup> Vita.

<sup>l</sup> De Sublimitate, sect. xxxiii.

escaped the observation of its editors and commentators; and that is the desideratum which we hope to supply in the remainder of this Dissertation, the subject of which is the calendar of the ancient Rhodes, as closely connected with that of the Argonautica. For it is agreed that the poem, which we possess at present, under this title, the second production of the author himself, was written at Rhodes; and that being the case, if he made use of any calendar at the time. and adjusted the details and circumstances of the action accordingly, it is naturally to be supposed it must have been that of the island where he was composing his poem, the island which adopted him among its citizens, and the style of which, as the Rhodian, he himself assumed in preference to that of his birthplace, Alexandria. This very natural presumption turns out to be true; and the business of this concluding chapter of the present Dissertation will be the proof and illustration of its truth.

SECTION III.—*On the length of time taken up by the Action of the Argonautica, and on the two classes of notes of time discoverable in it.*

The action of the Argonautica is purposely so contrived as to extend over the space of *one* lunar year; and so exactly, that it ends only the day before it began; i. e. on the very last day of this one year. The proofs of this assertion will appear as we proceed: at present it may suffice simply to state the fact. It is further observable that the action has been purposely distributed into two parts; one comprehending so much of the whole as belonged to the interval between the departure from Thessaly and the arrival at Colchis; the other, so much as was comprised between the arrival at Colchis and the return to Thessaly again; the first two books being devoted to the former, and the last two to the latter.

Now, in the entire poem, thus divided, two classes of notes of time are discoverable, which have hitherto escaped the observation of the commentators upon it; one of them derived from the solar Parapegmata of the time of the author, the other from the lunar. Each of these is as important to the proof of the conclusion which we have in view, as the other; and (what is the strongest proof of the truth and reality of

each) though liable in themselves to have run one into the other, and indiscriminately mixed in the body of the poem as they are, they are kept distinct—they are never confounded—they can be traced and considered separately, and they are found to be consistent, and to confirm each other. In order to obtain the first insight into the chronological structure of the poem, we will begin with the former.

SECTION IV.—*On the Solar Calendar of the Argonautica.*

i. First Criterion.

The first criterion of this kind is the length of the summer quarter, the interval between the summer solstice and the autumnal equinox, recognised in the poem, compared with that of the Parapegmata of the time. In the Parapegma of Meton and Euctemon this interval was one of 92 days. The stated date of the summer solstice in that calendar was June 27, and that of the autumnal equinox was September 27<sup>m</sup>, between which the interval was just 92 days.

Now, the voyage of the Argonauts being supposed to have begun on the morning of the first day<sup>n</sup>, and the course of the navigation being followed day by day<sup>o</sup>, and the length of time spent at Lemnos<sup>p</sup> only being left out of sight—their arrival at Samothrace, and their initiation in the mysteries there<sup>q</sup>, are seen to have taken place on the evening of the *eighth* day. And this date being assumed as a fixed point; if the succession of days and nights is followed thenceforward by means of the notices supplied in the Poem itself, (which are as minute and circumstantial as the necessity of the case can require,) down to the arrival in the river Phasis<sup>r</sup>, this will be found to have taken place on the evening of the 91st day; i. e. having left Samothrace on the morning of the 9th day, the Argonauts came to an anchor in the Phasis at Colchis on the evening of the 99th day; so that the morning after their arrival (the morning specified in so many words in the last line of the second book) was the 92nd from the morning after the initiation at Samothrace. And this 92nd day being the regular interval between the summer solstice and the autumnal equinox, in the

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. i. 461.

<sup>n</sup> i. 519.

<sup>o</sup> 519-910.

<sup>p</sup> 607-910.

<sup>q</sup> 910-921.

<sup>r</sup> i. 922-ii. 1289.



parapegmata of the time, and certainly in that of Meton, Euctemon, and Callippus; every one must allow it to be a very probable inference from this coincidence, that the Chronology of the Poem was purposely so contrived that the day of the departure from Samothrace should be the summer solstice, and the day of the arrival in the Phasis, reckoned from the morning after, (the arrival itself having taken place in the evening,) be the day before the autumnal equinox; and the length of the voyage from Samothrace to Colchis, be the length of the summer quarter—from the summer solstice to the autumnal equinox.

ii. Second Criterion.

The second criterion of the same kind, supplied by the Poem, is still more significant, and more decisive, than this first.

The date of the arrival at Samothrace, as before, being assumed as a fixed point, and the voyage from that quarter—thus supposed to have begun on the 9th day of the action—being followed, as before, from day to days, the arrival in the country of Phineus, over against Bithynia,

*Ἀντιπέρην γαίην Βιθυνίδι* †—

(which the Scholiast understands of Salmydessus, on the Thracian or European side of the Pontus,) is determined to the 26th day from Samothrace, the 34th of the action. Two days after this, including the day of the arrival, are clearly recognised as spent with Phineus, from morning until night<sup>v</sup>; and on the *third*, when the Argonauts should have resumed their voyage, the Etesian winds set in:

*Ἦρι δ' ἐτήσιαι αὔραι ἐπέχραον, αἶ τ' ἀνὰ πᾶσαν  
γαίαν ὁμῶς τοιῆδε Διὸς πνείουσιν ἀνάγκη* x.

And by this impediment to their further progress, it is supposed they were detained *forty days* longer; all the time at least for which these winds were continuing to blow: and that, according to Apollonius himself, could not have been less than forty days.

*Τοιοῦτο δ' ἔκητι  
γαίαν ἐπιψύχουσιν ἐτήσιαι ἐκ Διὸς αὔραι  
ἤματα τεσσαράκοντα* y.

<sup>s</sup> i. 922—ii. 177.

<sup>t</sup> ii. 177.

<sup>v</sup> ii. 175—306: 307—450: 451—499.

<sup>x</sup> ii. 500. cf. 502—529.

<sup>y</sup> ii. 526. cf. Vol. ii. 582.

On these suppositions the Etesians set in on the morning of the 28th day from Samothrace, and lasted until the morning of the 68th, when they must be supposed to have ceased, and the voyage to have been renewed<sup>z</sup>.

Let us reckon then 28 days from June 26. They bring us to July 24; which, on this principle, should be the date of the Etesian winds. In the Apparentiæ of Ptolemy<sup>a</sup>, opposite to Epiphi 29, there is an entry. *Εὐδόςφῳ ἐτησίαι πνέουσιν*, i. e. flare incipiunt—and this, reckoned by the rule of Ptolemy<sup>b</sup>, would be July 24. There is another, opposite to Thoth 4, *Καλλίπῳ...ἐτησίαι παύονται*—and that too denoting Sept. 2, it will imply that Callippus also must have dated their commencement 40 days before, July 24. This entry in Ptolemy too, being intended for the parallel of 15 hours, would suit that of Salmydessus in Thrace, little different from that of Constantinople, where the length of the longest day is exactly 15 hours. On the 5th of Thoth, (Sept. 3,) for the same parallel, he has *Κόριωι ἐτησίαι λήγουσι*, for the parallel of 15 hours also; which is only one day later than Callippus' date of the cessation, and implies the commencement only one day later too, July 25.

In the calendar of Geminus<sup>c</sup>, there is an entry, Parthenon 5, *Καλίπῳ...ἐτησίαι πνέουσιν*, in which the necessity of the case requires us to read *λήγουσι*, not *πνέουσιν*—and that too understood of the last morning, for which they continued still to blow, would agree to Ptolemy's date of September 2. On the common assumption that the duration of these winds, whensoever they began, and whensoever they ended, was 40 days, Callippus' date for their termination, Sept. 2, must imply that his date for their beginning was July 24. And as this natural phenomenon, stated as it was itself, was still supposed to be only the consequence of another, the Heliacal rising of the dog-star; if the date of the Etesiæ was supposed to be July 24, it will be thereby implied that the date of the Heliacal rising of Sirius was either July 24 also, or July 23, the day before. Accordingly, though we have in Geminus<sup>c</sup>, *Μέτωι κύων ἐπιτέλλει ἔως*, opposite to Karkinon 25, July 21, we have also, *Εὐκτῆμοι κύωι ἐπιτέλλει*, opposite to Karkinon

<sup>z</sup> ii. 533-570.<sup>a</sup> Uranologium.<sup>b</sup> See our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*, iv. 165.<sup>c</sup> Uranologium.

27, July 23: and the same for Eudoxus also—*Εὐδόξῳ κύων ἔως ἐπιτέλλει.*

Now if Apollonius dated the Etesiae July 24, there is no reason why he may not be supposed to have dated the rising of Sirius July 23; and if he really dated the former July 24, he must have dated the latter either the same day, or the day before. It is sufficient for our purpose however, and in illustration of the solar calendar by which he probably reckoned, in this instance, as that of Euctemon or Callippus, that he dated the Etesian winds on the 28th day of the voyage from Samothrace—which being assumed to have begun on the day of the summer solstice, June 27, is actually determined in that case to the 24th of July, the stated date of the Etesiae, according to Euctemon and Callippus.

### iii. Third Criterion.

There is a third criterion of the same kind, as clear and decisive as either of the preceding, yet distinct from both.

The course of the voyage, from the shores of Phineus, being followed as before day by day; on the 20th day, after leaving Salmydessus, the Argonauts landed on the island of Mars<sup>d</sup>, the *νησος ἀρητιῶς*<sup>e</sup>, inhabited by the birds with feathers of iron. That is, the day of the departure from Salmydessus being assumed as the 68th from Samothrace, that of this arrival at the island of Mars was the 87th: and the departure from Samothrace being dated June 27, and the departure from Salmydessus September 2; that of this arrival at the island of Mars must have been September 21.

Now it is at this point of time, and directly after the landing of the Argonauts on this island, that the narrative passes to the account of the voyage of the sons of Phrixus, Argus and his companions<sup>f</sup>, from Colchis to Orchomenus in Greece: on which it is supposed they had only just set out when they were shipwrecked on this island. The circumstance to which attention should be directed in the history of this adventure is, That they are supposed to have been sailing on the morn-

<sup>d</sup> ii. 533-1091.

<sup>e</sup> ii. 1033. cf. *Geographi Min.* iii. The Epitome of the *Descriptio Ponti Euxini* of Arrian, pag. 13: *Αὕτη ἡ Ἀρητιῶς νησος λέγεται* Ἀρεος, ἦτοι

<sup>f</sup> *Ἀρεώνησος*. Cf. also Hyginus, *Fabb.* xx. *Stymphalides*, pag. 56: xxx. p. 73. *De Laboribus Herculis*.

<sup>f</sup> ii. 1092. cf. 384-393.

ing of the same day on which the Argonauts landed on the island; and to have encountered the storm, by which they were wrecked at last, towards the close of the day, and to have been cast on the island in the course of the night, or the next morning: so that, if the Argonauts landed on the island on the morning of September 21, these sons of Phrixus must have been cast upon it on the morning of September 22. This appears very clearly from the summary account of their adventures, which Argus himself gives to Æetes in Colchis, at the first interview between him and Jason, only four days afterwards §.

Αίητη, κείνην μὲν ἄφαρ διέχευαν ἄελλαι  
 ζαχρηεῖς· αὐτοὺς δ' ὑπὸ δούρασι πεπτηῶτας  
 νήσου Ἐνναλίῳ ποτὶ ξερὸν ἔκβαλε κῆμα  
 λυγαίη ὑπὸ νυκτί· θεὸς δέ τις ἄμμ' ἐσάωσεν.  
 οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ τὸ πάροιθεν ἐρημαίην κατὰ νήσον  
 ἠύλιζοντ' ὄρνιθες Ἀρήϊαι, οὐδ' ἔτι κείνας  
 εὔρομεν. ἀλλ' οἷγ' ἄνδρες ἀπήλασαν, ἐξαποβάντες  
 νηὸς εἴης προτέρωφ ἐνὶ ἡματι.

Now among the ἐπισημασίαι, (the affections of the air,) connected with the risings and settings of the stars, which we had occasion to illustrate elsewhere<sup>h</sup>, there was none to which the ancients attributed a more regular and sensible operation than that which was supposed to attend on the heliacal rising of Arcturus. The particular concomitant too of this sidereal phenomenon was violent winds and rains. It is very observable, and of critical importance to the determination of the sidereal calendar by which Apollonius must have reckoned, that the storm, which surprised the sons of Phrixus, coincided with the heliacal rising of Arcturus; and was in fact the direct ἐπισημασία of that phenomenon. The testimony of the poem itself puts this out of question<sup>i</sup>—

Καὶ δὴ ἔσαν νήσοιο μάλα σχεδὸν ἡματι κείνω·  
 Ζεὺς δ' ἀνέμου Βορέας μένος κίνησεν ἀῆλαι,  
 ὕδατι σημαίνων διερὴν ὁδὸν Ἀρκτούροιο.

On which the Scholiast: Τοῦτο δὲ ἔφη, ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιτολήν τοῦ Ἀρκτούρου σφοδροὶ καταχέονται ὕμβροι, ὡς φησι Δημόκριτος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀστρολογίας, καὶ Ἄρατος·

Φράζεσθαι δ' αἰνοῦ μεμνημένος Ἀρκτούροιο<sup>k</sup>.

§ iii. 320.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. i. 465.

<sup>i</sup> ii. 1099.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Διοσημ. 13.

The account proceeds to describe the gradually increasing violence of this north-wind, thus commissioned to blow, all the day, and especially towards the night<sup>1</sup>.

Αὐτὰρ ὄγ' ἡμάτιος μὲν ἐν οὐρεσι φύλλ' ἐτίνασσε  
 τυτθὸν ἐπ' ἀκροτάοισιν ἀήσυρος ἀκρεμόνεσσι·  
 νυκτὶ δ' ἔβη πόντονδε πελώριος, ὄρσε δὲ κῦμα  
 κεκληγῶς πνοιῆσι.

And, to shew that rain, the invariable affection of the sympathy of the elements with this star, was not wanting, it continues<sup>m</sup>—

Αὐτίκα δ' ἐρράγη ὄμβρος ἀθέσφατος, ὕε δὲ πόντον  
 καὶ νῆσον, καὶ πᾶσαν ὄσσην κατεναντία νήσου  
 (νῆσόν τ' ἠπειρόν τε, περαιῖς ἀγχόθι νήσου,)  
 χώρην Μοσσύνοικοι ὑπέρβιοι ἀμφενέμοιτο<sup>n</sup>—

And this lasts all the night<sup>o</sup>—

Τοὺς δ' ἄμυδις κρατερῶ σὺν δούρατι κύματος ὀρμῇ  
 υἷηας Φρίξιοιο μετ' ἠϊόνας βάλε νήσου  
 νύχθ' ὑπὸ λυγαίην· τὸ δὲ μυρίον ἐκ Διὸς ὕδαρ  
 λήξεν ἄμ' ἠελίω· τάχα δ' ἐγγύθεν ἀντεβόλησαν  
 ἀλλήλοισ.

All this is a clear description of the rising of Arcturus, and of its effects on the weather, according to the opinion and belief of the times. Let us then consider what dates the parapegmata of antiquity assigned to that phenomenon.

Now though Euctemon's date for the heliacal rising in question, according to Geminus<sup>p</sup>, was Parthenon 10, Sept. 6. and Callippus', Parthenon 17, Sept. 13, and Eudoxus', Parthenon 19, September 15; Ptolemy De Apparentiis has a date of the same phenomenon, for the latitude of 15 hours, Thoth 23, Sept. 21<sup>q</sup>: and this would agree so exactly to the parallel of the island of Mars\*, (only half a degree less than that of Constantinople,) and to the date of the arrival of the Argonauts there, that no one can hesitate to conclude that, from whatsoever quarter Apollonius derived it, it must have been that which he had in his eye, in this part of his poem. It is clear, from his description, that the influence of the star began to be felt by the air and the elements on the morning

\* This island is placed by D'Anville close to the ancient Kerasus, in lat. 40°. 24' or 25' N.

<sup>1</sup> ii. 1102.

<sup>m</sup> 1117-1120.  
<sup>p</sup> Uranologium.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. 1115.  
<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> 1121.

of this very day; first in the rising of the wind, and its gradually-increasing violence until evening or nightfall, when the star would first be setting; and then, in the confirmed tempest, both of wind and rain, which set in and lasted all night. Yet this too is supposed to cease at sunrise, or just before it, the next morning, when the star too would again be rising in the morning dawn; and this also implies that the *ἐπισημασία*, having been true to its time, (that of the first appearance of the star the morning before,) was true to its duration also, from the rising on that morning to the rising on the next. And this being the case, one cannot but admire the art and management of the poet, whereby the Argonauts in particular, apparently without any design on his part, are made to land safely on the island early this very day, before the influence of the star could yet be supposed to have affected the weather, while the sons of Phrixus, in the midst of the sea, are necessarily exposed to the violence of the storm, due to this influence at last; in order that by being shipwrecked on the island they might, without any unnatural supposition, be brought into the company of the Argonauts—as the part which they were intended to take in the œconomy of the rest of the action required them to be—before the arrival at Colchis.

iv. General conclusion from the above premises.

We have thus ascertained four different points of time in the action of the *Argonautica*, the dates of which must have been taken from the solar *parapegmata* of Apollonius' day—the time of the arrival at Samothrace, the day before the summer solstice, June 26; the time of the arrival at Salmydessus, two days before the setting in of the Etesian winds, July 22; the time of the landing on the island of Mars, the morning of the heliacal rising of Arcturus, Sept. 21; and the time of the arrival in the Phasis, as dated with the morning after that arrival the evening of the day before, one day before the autumnal equinox, Sept. 26. No one can deny that these dates are consistent with each other; and that any one of these being given, the rest are consequentially deducible from it. If so, they cannot be explained on any principle but that of the deliberate adaptation of the outline and de-

tails of the poem to a scheme of chronology laid down for them beforehand, and of the disposition and arrangement of the intermediate events of the action accordingly. Enough therefore has now been done to satisfy the reader that, beginning on the day after the arrival at Samothrace, and ending on the day after the arrival at Colchis, the first two books of the *Argonautica* contain 92 days exactly; the first of which was the date of the summer solstice, and the last was the date of the autumnal equinox, according to the solar parapegmata of the time being. There are yet other chronological notices discoverable in the poem; which can be explained only by a reference to the lunar calendars of the same period. And to these we shall next proceed.

SECTION V.—*On the Civil Calendar of the Argonautica; and whether Solar or Lunar in general.*

Among the traditions connected with the voyage and adventures of the Argonauts, one of the most remarkable was this; That having been stranded on the coast of Libya, in the midst of the Syrtis, and having no other means of extricating themselves from the situation in which they were thereby placed, they transported the ship *Argo* on their own shoulders, twelve days' journey across the desert, as far as the *Palus Tritonis* and the gardens of the *Hesperides*.

The antiquity of this tradition appears from *Pindar*<sup>s</sup>. *Apollonius* has adopted it, and given the fact a place among the other particulars of his fourth book<sup>s</sup>; though, with a becoming regard to verisimilitude, he does not venture to vouch for its truth himself, but appeals to the *Muses*, and rests the credibility of the story on their authority.

Μουσάων ὄδε μῦθος· ἐγὼ δ' ὑπακουὸς αἰείδω  
 Πιερίδων, καὶ τήνδε πανατρεκὲς ἔκλυον ὀμφήν,  
 ὑμέας, ὧ περὶ δὴ μέγα φέρτατοι νιῆς ἀνάκτων,  
 ἦ βίη, ἦ τ' ἀρετῇ, Λιβύης ἀνὰ θίνας ἐρήμους  
 νῆα μεταχρονίην, ὅσα τ' ἔνδοθι νηὸς ἄγεσθε,  
 ἀνθεμένους ὥμοισι, φέρειν δυοκαίδεκα πάντα  
 ἤμαθ' ὁμοῦ νύκτας τε<sup>t</sup>—

Now they are supposed to have arrived at this spot only

<sup>r</sup> *Pythia*, iv. 44. cf. *Herod.* iv. 179.

<sup>s</sup> iv. 1232–1380.

<sup>t</sup> iv. 1381–1395. cf. 1537–1546; 1551. 1566.

the day after it was visited by Hercules also in quest of the golden apples; and to have found the remains of the dragon, surnamed Ladon, which had guarded the apples the day before, still quivering in the agonies of death, and the *νύμφαι* 'Εσπερίδες still bemoaning their recent loss<sup>v</sup>—

Ἴξον δ' ἱερὸν πῆδον, ᾧ ἔνι Λάδων  
 εἰσέτι που χθιζὸν παγχρύσεια ῥύετο μῆλα  
 χάρωφ' ἐν' Ἀτλαντος, χθόνιος ὄφεις· ἀμφὶ δὲ Νύμφαι  
 'Εσπερίδες ποίπνυον, ἐφίμερον αἰίδουσαι.  
 δὴ τότε γ' ἦδη κείνος ὑφ' Ἡρακλῆϊ δαΐχθεις  
 μήλειον βέβλητο ποτὶ στύπος· οἴοθι δ' ἄκρη  
 οὐρῆ ἔτι σπαίρεσκεν—  
 ἀγχοῦ δ' 'Εσπερίδες, κεφαλῆς ἔπι χεῖρας ἔχουσαι  
 ἀργυφέας ξανθῆσι, λίγ' ἔστενον—

And having been made aware by these of what had just occurred<sup>x</sup>, five of their number (the two sons of Boreas, Zethus and Calais, Euphemus, Lynkeus, and Canthus<sup>y</sup>;) set out in the hope of overtaking Hercules; for Hercules had been one of their body at first, and had accompanied them as far as the region of Kius, but had there been lost, and left behind, and along with him another of their number, Polyphemus, son of Elatus, the friend of Canthus. But the hero was already too far advanced on his way homeward. The far-seeing eye of Lynkeus only catches a glimpse of him in the distant horizon of the desert, which Apollonius compares to the first hasty and transient discovery of the new moon—

Ἄτὰρ τότε γ' Ἡρακλῆα  
 μῦνον ἀπειρεσίης τηλοῦ χθονὸς εἴσατο Λυγκεῖς  
 τὼς ἰδέειν, ὡς τίς τε νέφ' ἐνὶ ἡματι μῆνην  
 ἦ ἴδεν, ἦ ἐδόκησεν ἐπαχλύουσαν ἰδέσθαι<sup>z</sup>.

And this is one of the passages of the Argonautica which Virgil has imitated—

Qualem primo qui surgere mense  
 Aut videt aut vidisse putat per nubila lunam<sup>a</sup>.

Primo mense here is either the *first day* of the month, or the *first month* of the year; and in either case the first day of the civil or calendar month, or the first of the civil or calendar year. And this appears still more clearly from the *νέω ἐνὶ ἡματι*

<sup>v</sup> iv. 1396.<sup>x</sup> iv. 1430-1449.<sup>y</sup> iv. 1461.<sup>z</sup> iv. 1477.<sup>a</sup> Æneid. vi. 453.



of the Greek original; which is simply the idiomatic style of the first day of the civil lunar month, the *ρουμηνία*, or the first of the civil lunar year, the *νέα ἡμέρα*. The civil month then, or the civil year, recognised by Apollonius in this passage, was the lunar, not the solar. And though it must be admitted that no other clear allusion of the same kind is to be found in the *Argonautica*<sup>b</sup>, yet even this is sufficient to establish the point in question, if there could be any doubt concerning it, or if it could be considered probable *a priori* on any account, that the calendar recognised by Apollonius would be anything different from the Greek calendar of his own time in general, which, so far as we know, was still everywhere, without exception, lunar.

i. First Criterion of the Calendar of the *Argonautica*, as  
Lunar in general.

A criterion of this kind is discoverable early in the poem, very unquestionable and very precise, which we shall point out first of all.

The final departure of the Argonauts from the country of the Doliones, the site of the Kyzicus of after-times<sup>c</sup>, where they had been detained eighteen days<sup>d</sup>, takes place on the 22nd morning from Samothrace<sup>e</sup>. The first part of this day is spent in a contest of rowing<sup>f</sup>—

Ἔνθ' ἔρις ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἀριστήων ὀρόθουνεν,  
ὅστις ἀπολήξειε πανύστατος· ἀμφὶ γὰρ αἰθῆρ  
νήνεμος ἐστόρεσεν δίνας, κατὰ δ' εὔνασε πόντον.

And this continues until past the point of noon, when the day having begun to decline, and a fresh breeze, as usual at that time of the day, having set in towards the sea, the rest of the Argonauts were glad to take advantage of it, and repose on their oars for a while<sup>g</sup>—

Ἐμπης δ' ἐγρομένοιο σάλου ζαχρηέσιν αὔραις,  
αἱ νέον ἐκ ποταμῶν ὑπὸ δείελον ἠερέθοντο,  
τειρόμενοι καμάτῳ μετελώφεον—

And it should be here observed, that if we are right in the conclusions already established, the date of the departure

<sup>b</sup> Cf. iii. 533 : iv. 1615.  
<sup>c</sup> 1151.

<sup>c</sup> i. 934-936.  
<sup>f</sup> 1153.

<sup>d</sup> 953-1149.  
<sup>g</sup> 1159.

from Kyzicus must have been July 18, one of the hottest days of the year; when the sea was most likely to be becalmed, and the Argonauts to be most completely exhausted by their own exertions in rowing: circumstances to which we draw attention, merely to shew with what strict propriety the account was put together, and one thing adapted to another without any appearance of design.

The sturdy Hercules alone continues to ply his task as vigorously as ever, and to row the ship on with his single strength, until at last, when they had got opposite to the mouth of the Rhyndacus <sup>h</sup>, he breaks his oar, which compels him also to desist; and about that time of the day, which is described as the usual season of the *δώρας*, (the *cœna* of the heroic age,) they all land for the night, in the country of Mysia, at the mouth of the river Kius <sup>i</sup>.

After this, when the rest were preparing for their evening's repast <sup>k</sup> on the shore, Hercules himself goes up into the woods <sup>l</sup> in search of another oar, and Hylas, his page or squire, sets out at the same time in quest of water, to prepare his supper, against his return <sup>m</sup>.

Τόφρα δ' Ὑλας χαλκῆν σὺν κάλπιδι νόσφιν ὀμίλου  
 δίξετο κρηναῖης ἱερὸν ῥόον' ὧς κέν οἱ ὕδωρ  
 φθαίῃ ἀφυσσάμενος ποτιδώριον, ἄλλα τε πάντα  
 ὀτραλέως κατὰ κόσμον ἐπαρτίσσειεν ἰόντι.

All this, no doubt, was purposely contrived, whether agreeably also to tradition or not \*, in order to the disappearance of Hylas, and through that the separation of Hercules from the rest of the Argonauts, who was believed to have been one of their body at first, but not to have continued so to the end. There was another of their companions also, Polyphemus, son of Elatus, who likewise, agreeably to the received tradition, must, in some manner or other, be left behind in this part of Mysia, or Bithynia, where they now were <sup>n</sup>; and after founding a city there was to fulfil his destiny in the

\* Cf. *Paroemiographi Græci*, e Cod. Bodleiano, 888. pag. 109. Τὸν Ὑλαν κραυγάζουσιν κ', τ. λ. καὶ ἔτι δέ φασι τοὺς Κιανοὺς ὠρισμένην ἡμέραν κατ' ἔτος ἀνακαλεῖσθαι τὸν Ὑλαν. Also Photii Lex. Ὑλαν κραυγάζειν.

<sup>h</sup> i. 1161-1171.

<sup>l</sup> 1187-1206.

<sup>i</sup> 1172-1178.

<sup>m</sup> 1207.

<sup>k</sup> 1182-1186.

<sup>n</sup> 1310-1323.

same quarter, by falling in battle with the Chalybes. And each of these events is brought about first by the adventure of Hercules in breaking his oar, and secondly by the loss of Hylas.

The disappearance of Hylas however, agreeably to the invariable tenor of the fable, wheresoever we find it referred to, was to be attributed to the sudden passion of the goddess of the spring, as soon as she caught a glimpse of the beautiful stranger, stooping to take out the water of which he was in search: and the circumstance here to be remarked is this, that as it must evidently have been the close of the day, when Hylas set out on his errand, so it is by the *light* of the *moon* that the nymph is supposed to distinguish his person, and to be smitten with the sudden effulgence of his youthful charms<sup>o</sup>—

Ἡ δὲ νέον κρήνης ἀνεδύετο καλλιναίοιο  
 Νύμφη ἐφυδατή· τὸν δὲ σχεδὸν εἰσενόησε  
 κάλλει καὶ γλυκερῆσιν ἔρευθόμενον χαρίτεσσι·  
 πρὸς γάρ οἱ διχόμενης ἀπ' αἰθέρος αὐγάζουσα  
 βάλλε Σεληναίη—

It is a further intimation of a moonlight night that Polyphemus, the only one of the Argonauts who hears the cry of Hylas as he falls into the spring, and rushes immediately to his relief<sup>p</sup>, meets Hercules returning to the ship, and easily recognises him, though in the night<sup>q</sup>—

Ἐνθ' αὐτῷ ξύμβλητο κατὰ στίβον Ἡρακλῆϊ,  
 γυμνὸν ἐπαίσσων παλάμη ξίφος· εὖ δέ μιν ἔγνω  
 σπερχόμενον μετὰ νῆα διὰ κνέφας—

Nor is it any objection, that *διὰ κνέφας* properly means “in the dark.” It stands here merely for “in the night.” It is one of the most familiar idioms of Apollonius to use this term *κνέφας* instead of *νύξ*, simply to express the night—whether otherwise dark, or not; as no one who has read him with any attention can have failed to observe.

Now, as the scholiast remarks on this passage, the proper sense of *διχόμενης* is *πανσέληνος*. The same term is applied to the moon again in a subsequent passage, in order to describe the joy or the admiration of Jason, when grasping and contemplating the Fleece of Gold, by comparing it to that of a

o i. 1228.

p 1240.

q 1253.

virgin, playfully catching the beams of the rising full moon, through the lattice of her chamber windows, upon the thin ground of her fine-spun robes, and admiring their brilliant hues as they mingled with the colours and tissues of the garment <sup>r</sup> —

᾽Ως δὲ σεληναίην διχομήνιδα παρθένος αἴγλην  
 ὑψόθεν ἐξανέχουσαν ὑπὸ ρόφιος θαλάμιοι  
 λεπταλέῳ ἐανῶ ὑποῖσχεται· ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ  
 χαίρει δερκομένης καλὸν σέλας· ὥς τότε Ἴησων  
 γηθόσυννος μέγα κῶας εἰς ἐναίρατο χερσίν.

But the proper sense of *διχομήνις* is also the full of the moon, as dividing the month<sup>s</sup>; on which principle, if the night of their arrival at the mouth of the Kius was the night of the 22nd day from Samothrace—it was also the night of the 15th day of the lunar month, the night of the 16th reckoned from evening or sunset, according to the common Greek rule. Now the day of the departure from Samothrace being assumed as June 27, the 22nd day after the departure must have been July 18; and the evening of that day being that of the full moon, in this sense of *διχομήνις* also, must have been the evening of the 15th of the lunar, in the sense of the civil or calendar, month.

This note of time is consequently as precise and definite a criterion of a lunar calendar as could be desired. It ascertains a lunar, in the sense of a civil or calendar, fifteenth on July 18, and a lunar sixteenth in the same sense on July 19, or reckoned from evening, July 18; and consequently a *luna prima*, in the same sense, on July 5 or 4.

## ii. Second Criterion of the Calendar of the Argonautica, as Lunar in general.

It is in our power to confirm this conclusion by a still more remarkable criterion of the same kind.

We have already observed that the date of the arrival in the Phasis was the 91st day from Samothrace; and at the end of that day: September 25 at sunset, if the date of the departure from Samothrace was June 27 at sunrise. The interval, supposed to have transpired between this arrival and the departure again, may clearly be ascertained, and

<sup>r</sup> iv. 167.

<sup>s</sup> See Orig. Kal. Ital. i. 238 n.

turns out to be neither more nor less than *four* days exactly<sup>t</sup>. The Argonauts arrived in the evening of one day, and set out on their return at sunrise on the morning of the fifth day after. The task prescribed by Æetes was all accomplished on the fourth day; so critically that the end of the task coincided with the end of the day<sup>v</sup>:

<sup>3</sup>Ἡμαρ ἔδν, καὶ τῷ τετελεσμένος ἦεν ἄεθλος.

The night which ensues (ushered in with the beginning of the fourth book) is supposed to have been differently passed by the different parties in the recent transactions, by Æetes and his Colchians, in council, plotting the destruction of the Argonauts<sup>x</sup>, by the Argonauts in carousing and keeping up bonfires on board their ship, to celebrate the triumphant issue of the late trial<sup>y</sup>, and by Medea in a state of continued anxiety and suspense<sup>z</sup>, which is terminated only by the formation of a sudden resolution to escape with the Argonauts, no sooner conceived than executed<sup>u</sup>. Nor, after this, is any time lost in securing the fleece, and hastening away<sup>b</sup>—

Ἡ δέ σφιν ἐς ἱερὸν ἄλσος ἀνώγει  
 νῆα θοῆν ἐλάαν αὐτοσχεδόν, ὄφρ' ἔτι νύκτωρ  
 κῶας ἐλόντες ἄγοιντο παρέκ νόον Αἰήταο.

The precise time of the night at which Jason and she set out from the ship for this purpose is thus described<sup>c</sup>:

<sup>3</sup>Ἡμος δ' ἀνέρες ὕπνον ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐβάλοντο  
 ἀγρόται, οἳ τε κύνεσσι πεποιθότες οὐ ποτε νύκτα  
 ἄγχαυρον κνώσσουσιν, ἀλευάμενοι φάος ἡοῦς,  
 μὴ πρὶν ἀμαλδύνη θηρῶν στίβον, ἠδὲ καὶ ὀδμῆν  
 θηρείην, λευκῆσιν ἐνισκίψασα βολῆσι·  
 τῆμος ἄρ' Αἰσονίδης κούρη τ' ἀπὸ νηὸς ἔβησαν  
 ποιήεντ' ἀνὰ χῶρον, ἵνα κριοῦ καλέονται  
 εὐναί, ὅθι πρῶτον κεκμηότα γούνατ' ἔκαμψε,  
 νότοισι φορέων Μινυήιον υἱ' Ἀθάμαντος.

Where the scholiast observes on ἄγχαυρον—Τὸν καιρὸν τὸν πλησίον καὶ ἐγγὺς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὥσπερ τὸ καλούμενον λυκόφως. περὶ γὰρ τὸν τοιοῦτον καιρὸν αἱ αὔραι πνέουσι. That is, the time intended was strictly before the break of day, yet strictly

<sup>t</sup> Cf. ii. 1288, 1289 : iii. 1-821. The first day.  
 iii. 822-1170. The second.  
 — 1171-1222. The third.  
 — 1222-1406. The fourth.  
 iv. 183. The fifth.

<sup>v</sup> iii. 1406. cf. 417.

<sup>x</sup> iv. 6.

<sup>y</sup> iv. 68.

<sup>z</sup> iv. 11.

<sup>a</sup> iv. 20-102.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 100. cf. 103-166 : 166-182.

<sup>c</sup> iv. 109.

also close on the point of daybreak. And that having been the case, the time of the arrival of Medea herself at the ship, just before, though still more in the night, must nevertheless have been not long before the end of the night and the beginning of the day.

Now, as she is supposed to be hastening from her own chamber, down to the river, in all that confusion of mind, and commotion and conflict of feelings, which the Poet describes<sup>d</sup>, she is descried by the moon, just rising; and the moon, which had so often experienced the baleful effect of her spells and charms, is very naturally represented as exulting at the sight of her distress<sup>e</sup>—

Τὴν δὲ νέον Τιτηνὺς ἀνερχομένη περάτηθεν  
φοιταλέην ἐσιδοῦσα θεὰ ἐπεχρήρατο Μῆνη  
ἀρπαλέως, καὶ τοῖα μετὰ φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἔειπε.

The meaning of these words ἀνερχομένη περάτηθεν is to point out the locality, from which the moon was now ascending into the air, the extremity of the horizon in the east. They designate consequently the moment of moon-rise. They are analogous to other phrases, in other instances, all more or less the same:

Ἦμος δ' οὐρανόθεν χαροπὴ ὑπολάμπεται ἡὼς  
ἐκ περάτης ἀνιοῦσα, διαγλαύσσουσι δ' ἀταρποί<sup>f</sup>.

Ἦμος δ' ἥλιος δροσερὰς ἐπέλαμψε κολώνας  
ἐκ περάτων ἀνίων<sup>g</sup>—

Αὐτὴ δ' ὠκυτέρῃ ἀμαρύγματος, ἡὲ βολάων  
ἡελίου, ὅτ' ἄνεισι περαιῆς ὑψόθι γαίης<sup>h</sup>.

Ἦὼς δ' ἀμβροσίοισιν ἀνερχομένη φαέεσσιν  
λῦε κελαινὴν νύκτα<sup>i</sup>—

Αὐτίκα δ' ἡὼς

φέγγεν ἀνερχομένη<sup>k</sup>.

It seems then that the moon was just rising when Medea was beginning to make her escape to the Argonauts. This is sufficient to prove that the full moon could not possibly have been meant; for the full moon must have been rising in the evening, and she was making her escape early in the morning. Besides which, notwithstanding this allusion to

<sup>d</sup> iv. 34-53.

<sup>h</sup> iv. 847.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 54-56.

<sup>i</sup> iv. 1170.

<sup>f</sup> i. 1280.

<sup>k</sup> iv. 1713.

<sup>g</sup> ii. 164.

the moon at this point of time, it is clear from the context that the night was dark, and there was nothing to direct Medea to the ship but the fires on board the Argo<sup>l</sup>. And this state of things continues until the break of day, the moment when Jason and she, having succeeded in securing the fleece<sup>m</sup>, returned with it to the ship<sup>n</sup>,

Ἦώς μὲν ῥ' ἐπὶ γαίαν ἐκίδνατο, τοὶ δ' ἐς ὄμιλον  
ἴξον—

Now that the moon was rising so little before the dawn of day, is an infallible argument of the end of the lunar month: and that it was rising under such circumstances, and yet that the night was dark notwithstanding, is an argument of the last day of the lunar month, the *τριακὰς* itself. For if it was rising on this morning so little before daybreak, or sunrise, it is evident that the next morning it would rise at daybreak, or with the sun, and therefore be in conjunction with the sun. The next morning under such circumstances must have been that of the *ἀτρεκῆς σὺνοδος*, or the *νοσημία*, properly so called; and therefore that of the day before must have been that of the *τριακὰς*, or *ἔτη καὶ νέα*, of the lunar month. Nor is it any difficulty that we are thus supposing the night to have been destitute of light, and yet the moon to have been rising. There is no inconsistency between these two things. The moon rises on the last day of the month, as much as on any other; only not visibly so. But the question is, not whether Medea could see the moon, in the act of rising, on the last morning of the month, but whether the moon, rising at that time, could see Medea: and the moon being here personified, and treated as *Μήνη* the *Τιτηνίς*, or sister of the Titans, there can be no doubt of this last fact. Let us then proceed to consider how far this conclusion, respecting the lunar character of the day of the departure of the Argonauts from Colchis, agrees with the former, respecting that of the day of the departure from Kyzicus.

Now the day of the departure from Kyzicus having been the 22nd from Samothrace, and this of the departure from Colchis the 96th, there was just 74 days' interval between

<sup>l</sup> iv. 67-69.

<sup>m</sup> 109.

<sup>n</sup> 183. cf. 166-182.

them. And these must have been equivalent to one lunar *δέμηρον* of 59 days, and half a month more, of 15 days. If then the day of the departure from Kyzicus was the lunar 15, the day of the departure from Colchis must have been the lunar 30, or *τριακάς*. The Julian dates of these respective days place this out of question. The departure from Kyzicus, and the 15th of the lunar month coincident with it, having been determined to July 18, the first of the same lunar month must have been July 5; the first of the next, reckoned at 29 days, August 3, the first of the next, September 2, and therefore the 30th=29th of that month, September 30. And the date of the arrival in the Phasis, reckoned from the morning after, having been September 26—that of the departure from it again, on the morning of the fifth day after, must have been September 30 also.

iii. On some other Criteria of the Calendar of the Argonautica, as Lunar in general.

We have not however by these means been enabled to determine merely the true lunar character of two important dates, (one early in the beginning, the other close to the end, of the first half of the action of the Argonautica;) we have also done much to explain and illustrate the lunar character of some of the intermediate dates, which will be found to confirm the same conclusion respecting the nature of the calendar, followed in the Poem, in general.

For example, i. In the description of the storm, which wrecked the sons of Phrixus on the island of Mars, though the stars are alluded to at the beginning of that storm the same night, the moon is not.

Νυκτι δ' ἔβη πόντονδε πελώριος, ὤρσε δὲ κύμα  
κεκληγῶς πνοιῆσι· κελαινὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἀχλὺς  
ἄμπεχεν, οὐδέ πη ἄστρα διανεία φαίνετ' ἰδέσθαι  
ἐκ νεφέων, σκοτούεις δὲ περὶ ζόφος ἠρήρειστο <sup>n</sup>.

But this was the night after the heliacal rising of Arcturus, the night of September 21; and if the moon was new, as we have seen it must have been supposed to be, September 2, it was 20 days old September 21; and consequently could not have been visible, if at all, until midnight, or after midnight.



ii. There would have been every reason *a priori* to conclude that the unfortunate encounter between the Argonauts and the hospitable Doliones, which led to the untimely death of Kyzicus, having taken place in the night, and under such circumstances that neither of the parties in it were able to recognise the other, must be supposed to have happened on a *νὺξ ἀσέλγητος*. And though this is not asserted in so many words to have been the case, it may be proved, by means of the lunar dates which we have just determined, to have been so.

The Argonauts arrived at Kyzicus at nightfall, on the third day from Samothrace<sup>o</sup>, (June 29): they left it again for the first time the next day<sup>p</sup>, (June 30), early enough (notwithstanding the events which had followed on their arrival and preceded their departure, including the battle with the *Γηγενεῖς* <sup>q</sup>) to accomplish almost a regular day's voyage before they were driven back to Kyzicus by the change of the wind<sup>r</sup>: with respect to which, the circumstance most to be noted is, that they were driven back the same night<sup>s</sup>, and landed on the shores of the Doliones again, the same night<sup>t</sup>; and Kyzicus fell by the hand of Jason the same night<sup>v\*</sup>: nor was it before the morning of the next day (July 1,) that the fatal mistake, whereby friends had been confounded with foes, was discovered.

Ἦῶθεν δ' ὄλοην καὶ ἀμήχανον εἰσενόησαν  
ἀπλακίην ἄμφω<sup>x</sup>.

This contest with the Doliones then is determined strictly to the night of June 30, and July 1, the night of the fourth day from Samothrace: consequently to the night of the 26th luna — for if the night of July 4–5 was that of the luna prima, then (the preceding moon being reckoned at 30 days) the night of June 30 to July 1 must have been that of the luna 26; at which period of the lunar month the moon must

\* Of the tradition relating to the presence of the Argonauts at Kyzicus, see Strabo, xii. 8. 69 a–71 b. De Kyzico; and the Scholia on Clem. Alex. Protrepticon, ii. 10. vol. iv. pag. 96: also the Scholia on the Argonautica in loc.

<sup>o</sup> i. 934–936.      <sup>p</sup> 985–1012.      <sup>q</sup> Ibid. 985–1010.      <sup>r</sup> i. 1015–1018.  
<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 1018, 1019.      <sup>t</sup> Ibid. 1022–1052.      <sup>v</sup> 1032–1039.  
<sup>x</sup> Ibid. 1053.

necessarily have been invisible, and the nights must have been ἀσέλῃνοι throughout. In strictness this lunar term, reckoned from sunset, or nightfall, would be the lunar 27th—the first of the nights of the silent moon, according to the ancients themselves\*.

SECTION VI.—*On the particular Lunar Calendar of the Argonautica.*

The two classes of chronological notices, which we proposed to consider, have thus been examined and compared; and they are found to agree so exactly, that no one can hesitate to infer from both together that they must have been purposely adapted to each other—that Apollonius could not have sat down to the composition of his Poem without having a particular solar, and a particular lunar, calendar before him, each of which he must have intended to take along with him, and must actually have taken along with him.

With respect to this solar calendar, there seems to be every reason to conclude it must have been one of these three, the Metonic, the Callippic, or that of Eudoxus; or possibly none of them in particular to the exclusion of the other two: though we incline to the opinion that if he must be supposed to have followed one more than another, it was probably the Metonic, or the Callippic correction of the Metonic, which differed from it very slightly. But as to the lunar calendar; the first thing necessary to the determination of that question is to ascertain whether any intimation can be discovered in the Argonautica, from which it may be inferred at what period in the natural year the civil year, as recognised in this Poem, must have been supposed to begin.

Now there is an intimation of that kind, which has not yet been produced.

\* Solon, quoted in the Geoponica, dates the silent moons from the 29th of one month to the second of the next; Geoponica, i. 13. cf. v. 10: vii. 6. p. 169. But Theophrastus dated them on the τετράς φθίνοντος, the 27th of the month: De Signis, vi. 5. 8. And so did Aratus, Diosemeia, 1148, and the Scholia. On the silent moon, see our Prolegomena ad Harmoniam Evangelicam, 278 note.

i. Beginning of the civil year, as recognised in the  
Argonautica.

On the seventh morning of the action, (early at least on the seventh day,) the Argonauts arrived at Lemnus<sup>γ</sup>.

Αὐτὰρ ἄμ' ἠελίοιο βολαῖς ἀνέμοιο λιπόντος,  
εἶρεσίη κραναὴν Σιντηΐδα Δῆμνον ἴκοντο—

on which follows immediately—

Ἐνθ' ἄμυδις πᾶς δῆμος ὑπερβασίησι γυναικῶν  
νηλειῶς δέδμητο παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι.

And here the important circumstance is the last observation, that the murder of the male population of the island, old and young, by the female, was a recent event when the Argonauts arrived there, an event of the year just *gone out*, or rather just *going out*; for that is the proper sense of παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι, in contradistinction to παρωχημένῳ λυκάβαντι. It follows that the Argonauts must have come to the island so critically just before the end or just after the beginning of the year, that the new year could scarcely be said to have yet come in, or the old year to have yet gone out.

The same thing is implied in the speech of Polyxo, an aged Lemnian matron, to the rest of the women of the island, when they were holding a council the same day, to deliberate on the kind of reception which they should give the Argonauts<sup>z</sup>.

Ἡ μὲν ἐγὼν, εἰ καί με τανῦν ἔτι πεφρίκασι  
Κῆρες, ἐπερχόμενον που οἶομαι εἰς ἔτος ἦδη  
γαῖαν ἐφέσσεσθαι, κτερέων ἀπὸ μοῖραν ἐλοῦσαν  
αὐτῶς ἢ θέμις ἐστὶ, πάρος κακότητα πελάσσαι.  
ὀπλοτέρησι δὲ πάγχυ τάδε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα<sup>a</sup>.

For here too this ἐπερχόμενον ἔτος is intended of a year either close at hand, or only just set in; in the course of which, at her advanced time of life, as she says, she might naturally expect to die, though alive at the beginning of it. It is clear then, from these two allusions, that the arrival of the Argonauts at Lemnus must have coincided with the beginning of the current year. It makes no difference whether

<sup>γ</sup> i. 607.

<sup>z</sup> i. 633-701.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. 689. cf. 668.

that was the year of Lemnus, or the year of the Argonauts, both being evidently supposed the same. And as to the relation of the beginning of this year to the natural, it was certainly earlier than seed time in the latter at least<sup>b</sup>. The arrival of the Argonauts at Lemnus however being dated on the 7th day after their departure from Thessaly, (i. e. the beginning of their voyage itself,) it is manifest that the beginning of this year and the beginning of the voyage must have been nearly coincident, and that if either could be determined, the other would be so too.

Here then it would be necessary to take into account the probable time of the year, at which a voyage like this, (the first of its kind ever undertaken among the Greeks, and to such a distance from their own country,) might most naturally be assumed to have begun—in other words, what could be most properly considered the earliest date of the mare apertum, at such a period, and on such an occasion as this<sup>c</sup>? To judge from the testimony of Theocritus, it must have been that of the *πλειάδων ἐπιτολή*, the last of the three such epochs recognised by the ancients in general. It is critically on the morning of that phenomenon that *he* dates the commencement of the voyage, in his Idyll entitled *Ἦλας*<sup>d</sup>, which takes up the account of the voyage with the arrival at the mouth of the Kius<sup>e</sup>, on the 22nd day from Samothrace, July 18, at evening. To judge from the testimony of Valerius Flaccus also, it must have been the same; since he too adopts this date for the beginning of *his* voyage<sup>f</sup>.

Indeed, there is reason to believe this must have been the traditionary date of that kind. In the Bibliotheca of Apollodorus, as we shall see by and by, the length of the voyage is supposed to have been four months exactly; and four months, reckoned back from the autumnal equinox, a certain day in September, as their latest term, would bring us to a certain day in May, as their earliest; and the *Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή*, in all the Parapegmata of the Greeks, and for every parallel of latitude, being dated on some day or other in May, this mode of describing and defining the length of the Argonautic

<sup>b</sup> i. 685–689: 795, 796: 825, 826.

<sup>d</sup> Idyll. xiii. 25.

<sup>c</sup> See supra, page 196. 221.

<sup>e</sup> i. 1178.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. ii. 72.

expedition is virtually the same thing as saying it began at the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή and terminated at the autumnal equinox. It is not likely that Apollonius at least would make choice of any other epoch for the commencement of his voyage, than Theocritus for that of his. The Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή was the ἀρχὴ θέρους also; and by beginning the voyage at that time the whole of the most favourable season in the natural year, from May to September, would be left open for the transaction of the first part of the action, at least; which, as we shall see by and by, was purposely made to terminate at the autumnal equinox.

ii. Identity of the Calendar of the Argonautica with the Calendar of Rhodes.

The calendar then which Apollonius took along with him in the composition of his poem must have borne date at the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή. That such calendars existed among the Greeks we know from the testimony of Censorinus; and that they were older than the time of Apollonius is equally probable. In this instance however we need not be long at a loss to discover the calendar, even of this description, which must have been adopted in the Argonautica; since the poem itself was written at Rhodes, and the Rhodian calendar of the time of the author supplies the desideratum at once. The epoch of that calendar, as we have seen, from B. C. 382 downwards, was May 6; and May 6, in the calendar of Meton and Euctemon, was the date both of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή and of the ἀρχὴ θέρους.

It is evident indeed that the beginning of the civil year, as recognised and assumed in the poem, could not long have preceded the arrival at Lemnus, on the seventh day after the voyage was fairly begun; nor that arrival long have preceded the arrival at Samothrace, the day after the Argonauts left Lemnus again. And this having been June 26, the day before the Metonic date of the summer solstice, June 27, the beginning of the voyage could not long have preceded the point of midsummer in the natural year. True it is, the length of the stay at Lemnus is left undefined, and to that indefiniteness all the uncertainty which besets this further

question of the beginning of the year of the Argonautica is in reality due. Had the number of days past at Lemnus been as distinctly specified as the length of the stay at Kyzicus, or the length of the sojourn with Phineus, or the interval past in Paphlagonia with Lycus, in the country of the Maryandyni, it would have been easy to determine how long the commencement of the voyage preceded the summer solstice. With respect to this number however we shall see hereafter that it was either a very short term of 8 days merely, or one comparatively much greater, amounting to one lunar month of 30 days, and eight days more of another; and this latter will turn out to have been probably the true state of the case.

To revert then to the lunar calendar of the Argonautica; a lunar 15th having been determined which coincided with July 18, and a lunar 30th which coincided with Sept. 30, the calendar of which each of these made a part, from July to October, must have stood as follows.

*Lunar Calendar of the Argonautica from July to October.*

---

Days.		Days.	
i.	29 July 5	iii.	29 Sept. 2
ii.	30 Aug. 3	iv.	30 Oct. 1

---

From which it will follow that the whole scheme of the same calendar, from May to October, must have proceeded accordingly.

*Lunar Calendar of the Argonautica from May to October.*

---

Days.		Days.	
i	29 May 7	iv	30 Aug. 3
ii	30 June 5	v	29 Sept. 2
iii	29 July 5	vi	30 Oct. 1

---

And what is this but the scheme of the Rhodian calendar for the first six months in the first year of every Callippic period? only that, agreeably to the Metonic style, the details of these six months must have been somewhat differently digested.

*Rhodian Calendar, Period iii. 1, from May to October.*


---

i	Artamitius	May 6	B. C. 230
ii	Panamus	June 5	
iii	Pedageitnyus	July 5	Ex. 3
iv	Hyakinthius	Aug. 3	
v	Carneus	Sept. 2	Ex. 6
vi	Thesmophorius	Oct. 1	

---

We cannot therefore hesitate to conclude that Apollonius' lunar calendar and this Rhodian one must have been the same. And that point being so far established, we shall now pass to the question of the absolute commencement of the voyage; which the conclusion thus obtained may perhaps enable us to decide.

SECTION VII.—*On the date of the commencement of the voyage of the Argonauts.*

---

i. Suspension of the chronological rule of the Argonautica, after the departure from the Phasis; and course supposed to have been taken by the Argonauts on their return.

It has been observed that the action of the Argonautica naturally distributed itself into two halves; one comprehended in the first two books, taking in the particulars between the departure from Thessaly and the arrival at Colchis; the other, in the last two, including all that happened between the arrival at Colchis and the return to Pagasæ.

It would not have suited the purpose of the poem to have taken the Argonauts home exactly by the same route by which they had been brought to Colchis. Such an œconomy must have been totally destitute of novelty, and therefore of interest, if it led merely to the description of the same scenes, or the repetition of the same incidents, as before; and if it studiously avoided that, it might have appeared to offend too largely and systematically against the truth, or the necessity of the case, to appear consistent and probable. Nor would such an œconomy for the remainder of the poem have been calculated to fall in with the still current traditions relating to this fabulous voyage; the adventures of the Argonauts elsewhere than at Colchis, and the supposed vestiges and me-

morials of their actual presence, in the course of their wanderings, not only on the coast of Africa, in the neighbourhood of the Syrtis and the Palus Tritonis, but also in the Mare Ligusticum and the Sinus Gallicus<sup>h</sup>—

Ἄλλὰ, θεαί, πῶς τῆσδε παρέξ ἄλδς, ἀμφί τε γαίαν  
 Ἀysonίην, νήσους τε Λιγυστίδας, αἱ καλέονται  
 Στοιχάδες, Ἀργώης περιώσια σήματα νηὸς  
 νημερτές πέφαιται; τίς ἀπόπροθι τόσσον ἀνάγκη  
 καὶ χρειώ σφ' ἐκόμισσε; τίνες σφέας ἤγαγον αἶραι;

For these Stœchades insulæ were situated not far from the mouth of the Rhone, and the site of Massilia or Marseilles, on the coast of Gaul<sup>i</sup>; and if the Argonauts were ever there, they must have passed by some means or other from the Pontus Euxinus into the Mare Celticum.

Now it appears from the Scholia<sup>k</sup> that while there were various other accounts of their return, and of the course it took, there was one which they attribute to a geographer called Timagetus, according to whom they sailed all the way from the Pontus Euxinus to this Sinus Gallicus up or down the river Ister or Danube—entering it first by one of its branches which discharged itself into the Pontus Euxinus, and sailing down it afterwards by another which emptied itself into the Sinus Gallicus\*. It is clear that this was the

\* Τιμάγητος δὲ ἐν ἁ' περὶ λιμένων τὸν Ἰστρον φησὶ καταφέρεισθαι ἐκ τῶν Κελτικῶν ὄρων· εἶτα ἐκδιδόναι εἰς Κελτικὴν λίμνην· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εἰς δύο σχίζεσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς τὸν Εὐξείνιον πόντον εἰσβάλλειν, τὸ δὲ εἰς τὴν Κελτικὴν θάλασσαν. διὰ δὲ τούτου τοῦ στόματος πλεύσαι τοὺς Ἀργοναυ-  
 τας καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς Τυρρηγίαν. κατακολουθεὶ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος<sup>1</sup>— Οὐδ-  
 εἰς δὲ ἱστορεῖ διὰ τούτου τοὺς Ἀργοναυτάς εἰσπεπλευκέναι εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν  
 θάλασσαν ἕξω Τιμαγήτου, ᾧ ἠκολούθησεν Ἀπολλώνιος... ὁ δὲ Ἰστρος, κατα-  
 φερόμενος ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων, ὅταν φθίση ἐπὶ τὸν μεταξὺ Σκυθίας καὶ Θράκης  
 τόπον σχίζεται εἰς δύο· καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν Εὐξείνιον πόντον βάλλει· τὸ  
 δὲ ἕτερον εἰς τὴν Τυρρηγικὴν θάλασσαν<sup>2</sup>. This notion of a double Ister  
 appears in the Periplus of Skylax<sup>3</sup>—Ἰστροί· Μετὰ δὲ Ἐνετούς εἰσιν ἔθνος  
 Ἰστροί, καὶ ποταμὸς Ἰστρος. οὗτος ὁ ποταμὸς καὶ εἰς τὸν Πόντον ἐκβάλλει—  
 Ῥήνῳ δ' ἐξείης ἐπιτέλλεται ἱερὸς Ἰστρος<sup>4</sup>.

Ὁ δὲ γεωγράφος φησι καὶ ἄλλον Ἰστρον ἐκ τούτου τὰς ἀρχὰς ἔχοντα ἐμβάλ-

<sup>g</sup> Cf. iv. 1620.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 552.

<sup>i</sup> Geographi Min. ii. Agathemerus, Ilib. i. cap. v. pag. 13: Αἱ δὲ Στοιχά-  
 δες, αἱ φερώνυμοι, ἐξῆς ἐπ' εὐθείας κεῖνται

πρὸ τῶν Μασσαλιακῶν πόλεων· αἱ μὲν  
 μείζους τρεῖς, δύο δὲ μικραὶ, αὐτῆς ἐγγυὲς  
 Μασσαλίας. Cf. Strabo, iv. 1. 297 a.

<sup>k</sup> Ad iv. 255. 284.

<sup>1</sup> Schol. ad Apoll. iv. 259.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ad 284. cf. 284–293. and the Schol. ad 292.

<sup>3</sup> Geographi Minores, i. p. 6, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Dionys. Periegetes, 298.



course which Apollonius too must have fixed upon, as the best suited to his purpose<sup>1</sup>; and very probably on the authority of this geographer. His Argonauts, after being left apparently in the Pontus Euxinus, at the mouth of the Ister, make their appearance again first off the region of Hyllis, in the Sinus Adriaticus, and among the *Λιβυρνίδες νῆσοι*<sup>m</sup>, Issa, Pityæa, Coreyra Nigra, Melite, Kerossus, and Nymphæa (described as the island of Calypso); all which they pass in succession, before they are driven back to the *Νῆσος Ἡλεκτρὶς*, or Amber island<sup>n</sup>, situated, as Apollonius supposes, in the inmost recesses of the Eridanus or Po. And from the Po they pass into the Rhone<sup>o</sup>, and so down that to the Stœchades Insulæ at last<sup>p</sup>. We must not however criticise either the history or the geography of the poem too strictly; especially in this part of its œconomy, which, as if to guard it beforehand against any objections of this kind, is purposely attributed to a direction of the gods, who signified their will that the Argonauts should adopt this course on their return, by an heavenly meteor, or shooting star<sup>q</sup>: wherein Virgil also has imitated Apollonius, making use of the same phenomenon to intimate the will of the gods to Anchises, that he should accompany Æneas in his escape from the fires of Troy<sup>r</sup>.

λειν εἰς τὸν Ἀδριῖν κὸλπον, κατὰ τινας, δι' οὗ καὶ δοκεῖ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ Ἀργὼ ἐκ τοῦ Εὐξείνου πόντου διεκπεσεῖν εἰς τὸ Ἀδριατικὸν πέλαγος . . . τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης οἶδεν ἐν οἷς λέγει ὅτι “οἱ τριχίαι μόνου ἀναπλέουσιν ἐκ τοῦ Πόντου εἰς τὸν Ἰστρον, εἶτα, ὅπου σχίζεται, καταπλέουσιν εἰς τὸν Ἀδριαν<sup>δ</sup>” — Οὐκ ὀλίγοι γὰρ τῶν τε ἀρχαίων συγγραφέων καὶ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων (ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Τίμαιος) φασὶ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας μετὰ τὴν τοῦ δόρατος ἀρπαγὴν, πυθόμενοι ἐπ’ Αἰήτου προκατελιγῆθαι ναυσὶ τὸ στόμα τοῦ Πόντου, πρᾶξιν ἐπιτελέσασθαι παράδοξον καὶ μνήμης ἀξίαν. ἀναπλεύσαντας γὰρ αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ Ταυαΐδος ποταμοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς . . . καθ’ ἑτέρου πάλιν ποταμοῦ, τὴν ῥύσιν ἔχοντος εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν, καταπλεύσαι πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν . . . καὶ πλησίον γενομένους Γαδείρων εἰς τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς θάλασσαν εἰσπλεύσαι<sup>6</sup>—Ἐκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐκ τοῦ Φάσιδος διελθεῖν (φησιν) εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν, εἶτα ἐκέθειν εἰς τὸν Νεῖλον, ὅθεν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν θάλασσαν . . . Ἡσίοδος δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος<sup>7</sup> ἐν Πυθιονίκαις καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ἐν Λυδῇ διὰ τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ φησιν ἐλθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς Λιβύην<sup>8</sup> καὶ βαστάσαντας τὴν Ἀργὼ εἰς τὸ ἡμέτερον πέλαγος γενέσθαι<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ii. 420-424: iv. 253-7. <sup>o</sup> 302-3. <sup>2</sup> <sup>m</sup> iv. 523-; 62. <sup>n</sup> Ibid. 563-596.  
<sup>o</sup> Ibid. 627. <sup>p</sup> Ibid. 627-650. <sup>q</sup> iv. 296-302. <sup>r</sup> Æneid. ii. 693.

<sup>5</sup> Eustathius in loc. cf. Strabo: Aristotle, De Animalibus, viii. 13. 232. 27: De Mirabilibus, 105. Opp. ii. 839. 9 ad dextr.

<sup>6</sup> Diodorus Sic. iv. 56.

<sup>7</sup> Scholia ad Pindar. Pythia, iv. 44.

<sup>8</sup> Scholia in Apoll. Rhod. iv. 257.  
 Cf. Mr. Grote, i. 326.

It is observable however that whereas the history of the voyage from Thessaly to Colchis is recorded with all possible circumstantiality, and nothing is easier than to trace the succession of particulars, by the help of the data which the poem itself furnishes, from day to day, the case is very different with the account of the first part of the return from Colchis to Thessaly again.

We have followed the chronology of the poem without interruption, from the morning of the departure from Samothrace to the morning of the departure from the Phasis, and found that the latter took place exactly on the 96th day from the former. This same circumstantiality in the notices of time continues to be observed for the first three days of the return <sup>s</sup>—

Οἱ δ' ἀνέμου λαιψηρὰ θεῆς βοηλήσιν ἀέντος,  
 Ἕρης . . . . .  
 ἦοι ἐνὶ τριτάτῃ πρυμνήσια νηὸς ἔδησαν  
 Παφλαγόνων ἀκτῆσι, πάροιθ' Ἄλνυο ποταμοῖο.

That is, in the country of Lycus and the Maryandyni <sup>t</sup>, in the same locality where Heraclea was afterwards founded by the Bœotians and the Megareans <sup>v</sup>, and where they had been hospitably entertained once before, on their way to Colchis <sup>x</sup>.

The reason of this distinction is obvious. The course of the voyage from Iolcus to Colchis, through the Hellespont and up the Pontus, was one of the most familiar of the kind to the Greeks of Apollonius' time. It lay along a line of coast planted with Greek settlements; it was every year traversed by seamen and merchants; the distances from one point upon it to another, and the time necessary to pass from one to another, whether with sails or with oars, had long been experimentally ascertained. But as to the new route, by which he was proposing to bring his Argonauts back, except as far as the Halys, or the mouth of the Danube, it was impossible that anything could have been known about it; and the very supposition of its possibility is itself the best proof that such was the case. Apollonius therefore has shewn his usual judgment in passing summarily and cursorily over this part of his account, though it must have been as

<sup>s</sup> iv. 241.

<sup>t</sup> iv. 298-300.

<sup>v</sup> ii. 748-852.

<sup>x</sup> ii. 723-900.

considerable in point of duration as any, and must have occupied the best part of the whole year taken up by the voyage.

It should however be observed that the winter of this year must have been included in this part of its duration, if the departure from the Phasis took place only three days after the autumnal equinox; and though there is no distinct allusion to that season of the natural year, or to the consequent necessity of suspending the further prosecution of the voyage until it was over, the art and skill of the poet are not the less to be admired, if he has so ordered the course of events that an interruption, so produced, which must be supposed to have come in somewhere or other soon after the departure from Colchis, should find its place only in this part of the narrative, between the last appearance of the Argonauts in the Pontus Euxinus and their first appearance in the Adriatic, which is thus passed over in silence.

## ii. Resumption of the chronological rule of the Argonautica.

With the arrival however in the Mare Internum, and even at the Stœchades Insulæ, the scene of the action would again be transferred to localities with which the Greeks of Apollonius' time were well acquainted; and therefore the same attention to minuteness of detail, in marking and defining the movements of the Argonauts from place to place, and from day to day, would again be possible. And it is very observable that this characteristic of the narrative begins to reappear from this time forward, and especially from that of the arrival at *Ææa*, and the purification of Jason and Medea by Kirke<sup>v</sup>. As soon as this is over, the precision of a journal distinguishes the rest of the account, down to the arrival at *Ægina*. And that being the case, we might make the day of the arrival at *Ææa*, and of the purification in question, (which also takes place critically in the morning<sup>z</sup>;) the point of departure, from which to calculate the chronology of the remainder of the poem, as we did that of the voyage to Colchis from the date of the arrival at Samothrace. It will

<sup>v</sup> *iv.* 659-752.

<sup>z</sup> *Ibid.* 670-752.

however be found more convenient to assume the next day, dated from morning also<sup>a</sup>; because it is that of the passage of the Argo through the gulf of Charybdis—an event brought about, according to the poem, through the express intervention of Hera, Thetis, and the Nereids, and therefore altogether *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*<sup>b</sup>.

iii. Date of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis.

The first thing which we have to do is to fix the date of this day. Now the morning of this day is thus described<sup>c</sup>—

*Ἦμος δ' ἄκρον ἔβαλλε φαεσφόρος οὐρανὸν Ἠὼς,  
δὴ τότε λαιψηροῖο κατηλυσιῆ Ζεφύροιο  
βαῖνον ἐπὶ κληΐδας ἀπὸ χθονός—*

And this is a plain intimation that in now resuming the voyage they were not anticipating the stated date of the *Ζεφύρου πνοῇ* at least; that is, according to all the *Parapegmata* of antiquity, the first or second week in February. Nor does it make any difference that a *west* wind would have been necessary at any time, for such a purpose as that of sailing out of the *Mare Tyrrhenum* through the *Fretum Siculum*. That may be true; and yet even a voyage like that would not have been described as undertaken, especially at this remote period in the art of navigation, before the earliest season in the natural year at which it could have been represented as begun, under any circumstances, with propriety.

In the description however of the passage itself, (which, as we have observed, was altogether due to Thetis and her sister Nereids,) a note of time occurs, which is critically important on this question, by fixing the date of the passage to the season of spring in general, and to the day of the vernal equinox in particular<sup>d</sup>.

*Ἄοσση δ' εἰαρινοῦ μηχανέται ἡματος αἴσα,  
τοσσάτιον μογέεσκον ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὀχλίζουσαι  
νῆα διέκ πέτρας πολυηχίας· οἱ δ' ἀνέμοιο  
αἰῆτις ἐπαυρόμενοι προτέρω θεόν· ὧκα δ' ἄμβιβον  
Θρινακρῆς λειμῶνα, βοῶν τροφὸν Ἥελίοιο.*

That is, it took Thetis and the Nereids the whole of the longest day of spring to accomplish their task. And what

<sup>a</sup> iv. 841–861 : 884, 885.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 753–965.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 885.

<sup>d</sup> iv. 961.

day of the spring that must have been, may be inferred from the comment of the Scholiast: "Ὅσον ἐστὶ διάστημα ἡμέρας ἐαρινῆς ἤγουν δώδεκα ὥρων διαστήματος μοῖρα. ἐαρινὴν δὲ εἴρηκεν ἡμέραν τὴν τῆς ἰσημερίας.

The Scholiast consequently understood it of the day of the vernal equinox; and it must be admitted that the length of a spring day as such is most properly that of the equinoctial day, neither more nor less than twelve equinoctial hours. If so, we have in this note of time a very precise intimation of the relation of this day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis to the natural year. It was the vernal equinox. The passage through the straits of Charybdis took place on this day, and occupied the whole of this day. The question is, What was the date of the vernal equinox which Apollonius was most likely to have adopted?

Now if he adopted the Metonic date of the summer solstice, June 27, and the Metonic date of the autumnal equinox, September 27, we may presume he must have adopted also the Metonic date of the winter solstice, and the Metonic date of the vernal equinox. The former of these, according to Geminus<sup>e</sup>, was Dec. 25. The latter he has not specified, though there is reason to believe it must have been March 24<sup>f</sup>; and Callippus' date for it, according to Geminus<sup>g</sup>, was actually March 24. We may presume then that the date of the vernal equinox, adopted by Apollonius, must have been either March 24, or March 25; between which he might be induced to fix upon the latter, because, if he was writing B. C. 230, or about that time, March 25, as our *Fasti Catholici*, or General Tables shew, was critically the true date of the vernal equinox.

We may assume it therefore as a settled point, that the supposed day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis was that of the vernal equinox; and the date of the vernal equinox, March 25. And that it was a spring day in general, and the most characteristic of spring, of spring days in particular, may be further inferred from the fact that the day after, (which on this principle would be the day after the equinox, March 26,) the Argonauts landed at Drepane, or

<sup>e</sup> Uranologium.

<sup>f</sup> See Vol. i. 461. 464.

<sup>g</sup> Uranologium.

Coreyra<sup>h</sup>; and the night after their landing the marriage of Jason and Medea is supposed to have been celebrated<sup>i</sup>, in honour of which the nymphs of the island are represented bringing flowers, i. e. the proper productions of spring<sup>k</sup>—

"Ανθεα δέ σφι  
Νύμφαι ἀμεργόμεναι λευκοῖς ἐνὶ ποικίλα κόλποις  
ἔσφόρεον—

iv. Chronology of the Argonautica from the day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis to that of the arrival at Pagasæ.

The use we may make of this assumption is the following :

The resumption of the voyage homeward being thus supposed to have begun on the day of the vernal equinox in the natural year, March 25 in the Julian, the reckoning of days and nights from this time forward may be traced without interruption down to the arrival at Ægina<sup>l</sup>, the last incident, distinctly mentioned, before the arrival at Pagasæ in Thesaly, and the landing there<sup>m</sup>; and it will be found to comprise a period of 40 days and nights, including both the day of the passage of the gulf, and that of the arrival at Ægina. The date of the former therefore having been March 25, that of the latter must have been May 3.

Now forasmuch as nothing more is supposed to have occurred after this arrival at Ægina, worthy of particular notice, except the return to Pagasæ at last—the *action* of the Poem may be said to have terminated with this coming to Ægina. And so it appears to be represented by the author himself; who apostrophises his Argonauts at this period of their return, as if now at the end of their labours<sup>n</sup>.

"Ἰλατ' ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος . . .  
. . . ἦδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείραθ' ἰκάνω  
ὑμετέρων καμάτων· ἐπεὶ οὐ νύ τις ὕμμιν ἄεθλος  
αὐθις ἀπ' Αἰγίνηθεν ἀνερχομένοισιν ἐτύχθη,  
οὔτ' ἀνέμων ἐριωλαὶ ἐνέσταθεν· ἀλλὰ ἔκηλοι  
γαίην Κεκροπίην, παρά τ' Αὐλίδα μετρήσαντες,  
Εὐβοίης ἔντοσθεν, Ὀπούντιά τ' ἄστεα Δοκρῶν,  
ἀσπασίως ἀκτὰς Παγασηίδας εἰσαπέβητε.

But their voyage itself could not be said to have come to an

<sup>h</sup> iv. 981-997.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 1058-1169.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. 1143. cf. 1158.

<sup>l</sup> iv. 1765.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. 1773-1781.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. 1773.

end, before they had got safe back to their own home; and that they could not have done, along the course thus marked out for them from Ægina, in less than two days and one night more: so that, if they landed at Ægina early on May 3, the 40th day of the return, reckoned from March 25, they could not have landed at Pagasæ before the evening of May 4 at least, the 41st. Let us then proceed to consider these dates in the lunar calendar of the time being.

The first day of the first month in the year of the departure being supposed to have borne date May 6, (the regular date of the first month of the first year of the third Callippic period of the Metonic correction at Rhodes, B.C. 230;) then by the law of the Metonic cycle the first of the same month the next year would bear date April 25°; and the 3rd of May, the date of the arrival at Ægina, would be the ninth of that month, the 4th of May, that of the arrival at Pagasæ would be the tenth.

It has been already observed<sup>p</sup>, that according to Apollodorus, the whole voyage of the Argonauts was completed in four months. He has given the history of the expedition, in his Bibliotheca<sup>q</sup>, in a manner so conformable to the Argonautica, that he might have taken it from that poem itself; and the last particular which he also mentions<sup>r</sup> is the landing at Ægina, and the contest among the Argonauts, which of them should get through his share of a common task (the provision of a fresh supply of water) soonest: to which contention the tradition of antiquity attributed the institution of the Ὑδροφόρια at Ægina, and the same kind of contest with which they were celebrated there ever after<sup>s</sup>. And he also concludes his account, after the departure from Ægina, Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ διὰ τῆς Εὐβοίας καὶ τῆς Λοκρίδος πλεύσαντες εἰς Ἴωλκὸν ἦλθον—which might have been taken from Apollonius; but he adds at the end of it: Τὸν πάντα πλοῦν ἐν τέσσαρσι μησὶ τελειώσαντες.

Now this could not have been taken from Apollonius, who has nowhere specified the length of the voyage from first to last; and if he has given us the means of calculating it, according to *his* representations of it, has furnished us with

<sup>o</sup> See Vol. vi. Appendix, Table i.

<sup>p</sup> Supra, 308.

<sup>q</sup> i. ix. § 16-26.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. § 26.

<sup>s</sup> Apollonius, iv. 1765-1772.

data more than sufficient to satisfy us that, in his opinion, and according to his representation of the actual course of events, it lasted much longer than four months. We consider it most probable therefore that this statement, with which the summary of the expedition in Apollodorus concludes, respecting its entire duration, was received from a distinct and independent tradition; part of the history of the real voyage from Thessaly to Colchis and back, which must sometime or other have been made, on which this fabulous one of the Argonautic expedition was ultimately founded: a voyage, which very probably began in May, and was over by the end of September. If any such tradition actually existed in the time of Apollodorus, it must have existed in that of Apollonius also; who, though he did not adopt it himself, (nor would it have suited the purpose of his poem to do so,) might nevertheless pay so much deference to it, as to bring back his Argonauts at the end of a complete year, as this tradition had done at the end of four months complete. And it is evident that, if he dated the beginning of their voyage at the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή in one year, and the close of it 42 days after the vernal equinox in the next, he must have supposed it to have taken up an entire year between: forty-two or forty-three days being the precise interval in the calendar of Meton and Euctemon, between the vernal equinox, March 24, and the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, May 6.

v. Date of the commencement of the voyage of the Argonauts.

Let us then turn, in the next place, to the circumstances of the commencement of the voyage—i. e. of the departure in the first instance from Iolcus, and afterwards from Aphetæ.

It is clear from the Poem itself, that it opens in strictness not on the day of the departure, but on the day before it<sup>v</sup>: and that would be something remarkable, did it not also appear that this day, though prior to that of the departure, was sacred to Phœbus; and spent, in this instance, in sacrificing to Phœbus, and in the usual festivities of an holiday of Phœbus. The next morning at daybreak the Argonauts, having been roused by Tiphys their pilot<sup>x</sup>, began their voyage;

<sup>t</sup> See supra page 167 note.

<sup>v</sup> i. 1-351. 353-518.

<sup>x</sup> i. 519.



and after one day's sail cast anchor, for the first night, on the coast of Magnesia, near the tomb of Dolops there *y*.

There was no doubt a certain propriety in supposing the day before the actual commencement of an expedition. (the origin of which was ultimately due to Apollo, and in which Apollo had promised to be the associate and assistant of Jason<sup>z</sup>.) to have been devoted to the honour of Apollo in particular. But if so, we must consider also that the day sacred to Apollo, especially at this early period, was the seventh of the month; and consequently if the Poem opened on the day sacred to Apollo, it must have opened on the seventh of the month. And besides this, that there was a closer connection between the worship of Apollo and the seventh of the month, than any other day in the calendar, appears from subsequent occasions in the course of the action; especially in what passed before and after the arrival at Anaphe<sup>a</sup>, and led to the first instance of the sacrifice to Apollo *αἰγλήτης* there; the date of which we hope to consider by and by. It is on every account therefore to be presumed that the *Argonautica*, as opening on the feast day of Apollo, must have opened on the seventh of the month; consequently on the seventh of the first month, in the lunar calendar adopted for the chronology of the Poem, the 7th of the first month in the Rhodian calendar; which in the first year of its proper Period and proper Cycle would be May 12.

It is further however observable, and at first sight a very unaccountable circumstance, that the voyage having been actually begun the day after this (the 8th of the month in question, May 13), and one day's sail actually completed, as far as the tomb of Dolops in Magnesia; the Argonauts are supposed to have staid two entire days on this spot—without attempting to continue their course. They arrived at sunset or evening; and sunset or evening, according to the scholiast<sup>b</sup>, being the stated time of the day for doing sacrifice to the Manes, they offered sacrifice, as soon as they arrived, to the shade of Dolops<sup>c</sup>:

*y* i. 585. 583.*z* i. 411-414.*a* iv. 1690-1714.*b* Ad . 587.*c* i. 587.

Καί μιν κυδαίνοντες, ὑπὸ κνέφας ἔντομα μῆλων  
 κείαν, ὄρινομένης ἀλὸς οἴδματι· διπλόα δ' ἀκταίς  
 ἤματ' ἐλινύσκον· ἀτὰρ τριτάτῳ προέηκαν  
 νῆα, τανυσσάμενοι περιώσιον ὑψόθι λαΐφος·  
 τὴν δ' ἀκτὴν Ἀφέτας Ἀργοῦς ἔτι κικλήσκουσι.

If anything is here intimated, as if to account for this delay, so early in the voyage, it must be the allusion to the sea's beginning to be agitated, on the evening of the arrival in this locality; and yet that is too indefinite to be understood of a storm, or of bad weather sufficiently serious or long to have occasioned an interruption of this kind, at the very beginning of the voyage. The truth is, the interposition of these two days at Aphetæ must have been altogether κατ' οἰκονομίαν, to serve a particular purpose. It was necessary in order to the explanation of the name of Aphetæ, that the Argo should finally set out from that locality; and for that reason it was brought there from Iolcos, two days before: and it was also necessary that it should not set sail, even from this spot, before the earliest term when the sea could be considered open for such an expedition, viz. the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή.

It is remarkable that the same œconomy had been observed in the Πρώτῃ ἔκδοσις of the Poem, with this difference however, as may be inferred from the scholia, that the two days of delay followed after verse 515, as the text stands at present; i. e. the song of Orpheus, which was, in fact, the close of the proceedings of the first day. The scholiast observes on this verse, Ἐν δὲ τῇ προεκδόσει μετὰ τοῦτο γέγραπται·

Ἦμος δὲ τριτάτῃ φάνη ἡὼς, τῇ δ' ἐπὶ νύκτα  
 βουθυσίαν Ἐκάτοιο κατ' αὐτόθι δαινυμένοισιν,  
 τῆμος ἄρ' ἐκ Διόθεν πνοιῆ πέσειν ὤρτο δὲ Τίφυς  
 κεκλόμενος βαίνειν ἐπὶ σέλμασι· τοὶ δ' αἴοντες.

ἔξης δὲ τῶν ἐκκειμένων,

σμερδαλέον δὲ λιμὴν κ', τ. λ.

which is line 524 at present: so that on this principle all that we read in the Argonautica at present between ver. 515 and 524 is new. And this is perhaps the only passage of the first edition which has come down entire.

It seems then that in the original conception of the Poem the feast of Apollo, instead of ending on the first day, was so designed as to last until the fourth day; all which time the

Argonauts were waiting for the wind to drop, in order to put to sea. They were detained then, in the first edition also, two days complete; but whether at Aphetæ does not appear, though most probably it was so: and the actual day of the departure was the same in the first as in the second edition, and the actual locality from which it took place also. If the date of the feast to Apollo on the first day was the same in each, the seventh of the month, and it was kept for three days in the one, and only one in the other, but at Aphetæ in the first edition, at Iolcos in the second—the final departure from Aphetæ at last would still be the same in each, the 11th of the month.

Now, there were probably two reasons, as we have intimated, for this peculiar æconomy in each of the versions of the Poem; one, that the action must open in each with the sacrifice to Apollo, and on the day sacred to Apollo, and therefore on the seventh of the month; the other, that the Argonauts must not set sail from the shores of Thessaly before the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή. The seventh of the month, the 12th of the Julian May in this instance, would be incompatible with the Metonic date of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, the first of the same month, May 6; but there was another date of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, probably better adapted to the latitude of Rhodes than the Metonic, with which Apollonius could not fail to have been equally well acquainted, the date of Eudoxus, the 22nd day in Taurus, according to Geminus<sup>d</sup>, May 15—as the Metonic date, May 6, was the 13th.

These two reasons would require an interposition of two days between the celebration of the sacrifice to Apollo, with which the Poem opens, and the departure from Aphetæ, with which the voyage began; two days which in the first edition were supposed to have been transacted along with the first at Aphetæ, in the second, and with better judgment, in our opinion, were divided between Iolcos and Aphetæ: the feast being kept at Iolcos, on the 7th of the month; the two days of delay being passed at Aphetæ, on the 9th and the 10th. The latter of these days was the date of the rising of the Pleiads, May 15, and the day after, May 16, the 11th of the month, (the first day on which such a voyage as this could begin, so

<sup>d</sup> Page 222.

as to begin after the heliacal rising of the Pleiads,) was the first of the voyage properly so called; dated with the departure from the coast of Thessaly.

The day of the beginning of the voyage then having been thus determined to the 11th of the current lunar month this year, and the day of the conclusion to the 10th of the same month, in the next; no one can doubt that these arrangements must have been purposely made in accommodation to each other; and the entire duration of the action of the Poem, as we observed *supra*<sup>e</sup>, must have been so strictly limited to the compass of one lunar year, as to come to an end at last on the very day before that on which it began at first.

vi. Length of the interval past in Lemnos.

The absolute date of the commencement of the voyage being thus assumed as the 11th of the first month, May 16, we are in a condition to determine the length of the stay in Lemnos, which we have hitherto left indefinite. The interposition of this episode in itself, and as conducive to the proper end and business of the expedition, appears to have answered no purpose except that of delaying the arrival at Samothrace, which Apollonius might have special reasons for not dating earlier than June 26, the day before the summer solstice, June 27. But it served an historical use and purpose, in connecting this fabulous voyage of the Argonauts with the real one under Jason, which must sometime or other have taken place; and of which tradition had always made this visit to Lemnos, and the intercourse with the women of Lemnos, to which the re-peopling of the island was ultimately due, one of the circumstances.

The date of the departure from Aphetæ having been the morning of the fifth day reckoned from the Luna 7, May 12, i. e. the Luna 11, May 16, the date of the arrival at Lemnos was the morning of the seventh day, the Luna 14, May 19: and the day of the departure again having been the morning of June 26, the duration of the stay there meanwhile, from morning to morning, must have been 38 days, from the 14th of the first month, May 19, to the 22d of the second, June

26. Nor can this interval be considered improbable, for a purpose at least intended *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, and by the poet himself attributed to the interposition of Aphrodite, in order to that effect <sup>d</sup>.

\* Κύπρις γὰρ ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἕμερον ὤρσει,  
'Ηφαιίστοιο χάριν πολυμήτιος, ὄφρα κεν αὐτίς  
ναίηται μετόπισθεν ἀκήρατος ἀνδράσι Λήμνος.

It is intimated in the narrative also that the stay of the Argonauts was protracted from day to day <sup>e</sup>—

'Αμβολίη δ' εἰς ἡμᾶρ ἀεὶ ἐξ ἡματος ἦε  
ναυτιλίας—

And it was terminated at last, and the voyage resumed, only in consequence of the indignant remonstrances of Hercules with the rest <sup>f</sup>. In all the epic poems of antiquity, of which the Argonautic expedition was the argument, this Lemnian episode appears to have cut the same conspicuous figure, and to have taken up a proportionable length of time. This is particularly true of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus, which has come down to posterity in the Latin, as Apollonius' has in the Greek; for in that poem it seems to have occupied a much longer interval than in that of Apollonius—little less than the whole of one natural year.

SECTION VIII.—*On the date of the Argonautic Expedition adopted by Apollonius.*

The coincidences of solar and lunar dates, which have thus been pointed out, can leave no doubt that when Apollonius was composing his Argonautica he must have had two calendars before him; a solar one, most probably the same with the Metonic, and a lunar one, altogether the same with the Rhodian of the epoch of B. C. 382.

The question then, which presents itself under such circumstances, is this, On what principle could he have considered the calendars of his own time, B. C. 382 or B. C. 230, applicable to the time of the Argonauts, and competent to serve for the chronology of the Argonautic expedition? In answer to which we observe. i. That if Dionysius of Halicarnassus had his reasons for believing that the vulgar Metonic calendar (the Attic calendar of his own time) might be car-

<sup>d</sup> i. 850.

<sup>e</sup> i. 861.

<sup>f</sup> 862 sqq.

ried back to the Trojan æra<sup>g</sup>, Apollonius too might have had equally good reasons for thinking that the Rhodian calendar of his own time might be carried back to the time of the Argonautic expedition. ii. That if we take into account the facts of his personal history, or the circumstances under which his *Argonautica* were written, it appears from the *Vita*, commonly prefixed to them, and from Suidas<sup>h</sup>, that he was the son of Silleus or Illeus, of Alexandria, and a contemporary of Callimachus and Eratosthenes, (the disciple of the former, and the successor in the care of the library at Alexandria of the latter;) and that his acme is to be dated in the reign of the third Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes.

Now this being the case; it is to be presumed that he must have been as well acquainted with the Chronological Canons of Eratosthenes as Dionysius of Halicarnassus; and that he might adopt his date for the capture of Troy, and for the Argonautic expedition, as implicitly as Dionysius himself. The latter indeed of these two has not been handed down in terms like the former; but Mr. Clinton has concluded from circumstantial reasons that it could not have been much different from B. C. 1225, 42 years before his date for *Troja capta*, B. C. 1183<sup>i</sup>. In our opinion, however, the interval of 42 years, between these two events, is too short to have been supposed by so accurate a chronologer as Eratosthenes, and one who is known to have made so much use of the natural length and succession of generations. Eratosthenes must have been aware that many of those who fought at Troy were sons of Argonauts; who must have been born at the time of the expedition, though still only infants. Apollonius himself gives us to understand that this was the case with Achilles in particular; whom he represents Chariclo, the wife of Chiron, as holding up in her arms while the *Argo* was passing by, in order that Peleus his father might catch a glimpse of him<sup>k</sup>. He must have assumed that the Argonauts were all in the flower of their age when they went on this expedition; i. e. neither much more nor much less than 30 years of age; and that their children were in the same predicament when they too gave in their names for the Trojan

<sup>g</sup> Vide vol. ii. 118.

<sup>h</sup> Ἀπολλώνιος. <sup>i</sup> *Fasti Hellenici*, i. p. 139. cf. p. 76, 77.

<sup>k</sup> i. 557.

expedition. But it should also be remembered that, according to the uniform tradition of antiquity, there was 20 years' interval between the time when the expedition was first set on foot, and the capture of Troy: and therefore that those who were 30 years old at the beginning of it could not have been less than 50 at the end\*.

It is much more probable therefore that, reasoning from such data as these, Eratosthenes would assume the Argonautic expedition 50 years at least before the capture of Troy: and to judge from what Apollonius himself has supposed of the age of Achilles at the time, he too must have been of the same opinion. Callimachus also was the author of a system of chronology, the principal dates in which, as compared with those of Eratosthenes, according to Mr. Clinton<sup>l</sup>, ranged about 56 years lower. But Apollonius could have had no inducement to prefer the dates of Callimachus to those of Eratosthenes; though Callimachus is said to have been his master. For some reason or other, the feelings of these two contemporary geniuses one towards the other were not those of the master and the scholar. The *Ibis* of Callimachus, the bitterest of invectives ever written, (as we may judge from the *Ibis* of Ovid, composed in imitation of it,) is said to have been levelled at Apollonius<sup>m</sup>; and it was either the satire or the ridicule of Callimachus, more than anything else, which drove him into retirement for a time, after the failure of his first attempt.

If however there was a standing difference of 56 years between these two systems of chronology, it would have made little difference in the present instance which date of the

\* Iphiclus, Admetus, Theseus, Oileus, Peleus, Telamon, Hercules, Nauplius, Neleus, Deucalion son of Minos, all these (and more) are enumerated among the Argonauts, (Hyginus, *Fabb.* xiv. cf. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, i. ix. 16: Diodorus, iv. 41. 49.) and all these were fathers of sons who fought at Troy. The testimony of Homer however is most important on this point; and according to that, Evenus the son of Jason and Hypsipyle was reigning at Lemnos, all through the siege of Troy: cf. *Iliad* H. 467:  $\Phi$ . 41:  $\Psi$ . 747: and if *he* was then between fifty and sixty years of age, he must have been born between B. C. 1231 and 1241. Such then must have been the true time of the true or historical expedition, on which *this* of fable was founded.

<sup>l</sup> *Fasti*, i. p. 139.

<sup>m</sup> Suidas, *Καλλιμάχος*.

expedition (whether Eratosthenes' or Callimachus') Apollonius might have adopted. Since therefore 53 cycles of 19 years = 1007 years, let us suppose him to have gone back 1007 years from B. C. 230, i. e. to B. C. 1237, and assumed that as the date in question, 54 years before Eratosthenes' date of the capture of Troy, B. C. 1183: then if, like Dionysius of Halicarnassus afterwards, he had no difficulty in conceiving the Greek calendar to have been lunar in the time of the Argonauts, as much as in his own, he could have had no difficulty in transferring the Metonic reckoning of his own time to that of the expedition.

This question, it is evident, is entirely distinct from that of the date of his poem itself; which nevertheless may very probably be assumed about this year, B. C. 230, too. If Apollonius flourished in the reign of Euergetes I. it must have been between B. C. 247 and B. C. 222; and if he succeeded Eratosthenes in the care of the library, it must have been about B. C. 195 or 194, if that is the most probable date of the death of Eratosthenes<sup>n</sup>. If Eratosthenes himself presided over the library 40 years, he too must have been appointed to that charge about B. C. 235; and that was most probably the time when Apollonius (then of the age of an *ἔφηβος*, according to the *Vita*, and certainly still very young,) produced his first attempt, which exposed him to so much raillery from his contemporaries, and ultimately drove him to Rhodes.

It is far from improbable therefore, that B. C. 230 was the very year in which he set about the composition of his second poem, on the same subject; the same which has come down to posterity, and the chronology of which we have been attempting to illustrate. It is certain at least that finding a calendar at Rhodes, as perfect of its kind as any which was in existence elsewhere, and what is more, bearing date at the *Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή*, he would have every inducement to make choice of that, if he wanted one for the benefit of his poem. And if he determined to avail himself of this, he would naturally take it in its normal or rectified state; that is, such as it was in the first year of its proper period and proper

<sup>n</sup> See Mr. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, iii. in anno: cf. p. 531-535 = 513-516: Suidas, *Ἐρατοσθένης*.



cycle. B. C. 230 was a year of that description, the first year of the third Callippic period of the Metonic correction at Rhodes, dated May 6, B. C. 382.

It remains then, in order to the completion of this subject, to exhibit the chronology of the poem, in synopsis or outline, from the beginning to the end; i. e. from the morning of the departure from Iolcos, the Luna 8<sup>a</sup>, the Julian May 13, to the evening of the arrival at Pagasæ, the Luna 10<sup>a</sup>, the Julian May 4, according to the conclusions above established: premising in the first place the scheme of the Rhodian calendar, for the interval in question.

*Metonic Calendar of Rhodes, Period iii. 1. Cycle i. 1. May 6, B. C. 230,*  
—April 25, B. C. 229.

Month.		Month.	
i Artamitius	May 6	vii Sminthius	Oct. 31 Ex. 9
ii Panamus	June 5	viii Diosthyus	Nov. 29
iii Pedageitnyus	July 5 Ex. 3	ix Agrianius	Dec. 29 — 12
iv Hyakinthius	Aug. 3	x Badromius	Jan. 27
v Carneius	Sept. 2 — 6	xi Theudæsius	Feb. 26 — 15
vi Thesmophorius	Oct. 1	xii Dalius	March 26

1 Artamitius April 25 Ex. 18.

## SECTION IX.—*Chronology of the Argonautica.*

### PART I.

From the beginning of the voyage to the arrival in Paphlagonia on the return.

Day.	Lunar.		Julian.	
	i.			
			May	
1	8	13		Ἀντὰρ ὄτ' αἰγλήεσσα φαεινοῖς ὄμμασιν Ἥως. i. 519-586: cf. 353. 450. 518.
4	11	16		διπλόα δ' ἀκταῖς ἤματ' ἐλινύεσκον' ἀτὰρ τριτάτῳ κ', τ. λ. i. 588-593.
5	12	17		ἤωθεν δ' Ὀμόλην. i. 594-600.
6	13	18		ἦρι δὲ νισσομένοισιν. i. 601-606.

Day.	i.	May	
7	14	19	αὐτὰρ ἄμ' ἠελίοιο βολαῖς. i. 607-909.
	ii.	June	
45	22	26	ἦ καὶ ἕβαιν' ἐπὶ νῆα. i. 910-915, 915-921.
46	23	17	κεῖθεν δ' εἰρεσίη. i. 922-928.
47	24	28	πέλαγος δὲ τὸ μὲν καθύπερθε λείλειπτο ἦρι. i. 928-930.
48	25	29	Δαρδανίην δὲ λιπόντες. i. 931-935, 936-965, 966-984.
49	26	30	ἦοι δ' εἰσανέβαν. i. 985-1011, 1012-1020, 1021-1052.
		July	
50	27	1	ἦῶθεν δ' ὀλοήν. i. 1053-1056.
53	30	4	ἦματα δὲ τρία πάντα. . . αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα. i. 1057-1077: cf. ii. 814, 817, 839.
	iii.		
65	13	16	ἐκ δὲ τότεν τρηχεῖαι ἀνῆρθθησαν ἄελλαι ἦμαθ' ὁμοῦ νύκτας τε δυώδεκα. i. 1078-1080, 1080-1103.
66	14	17	ῶρνυτο δ' ἐξ εὐνῆς. i. 1104-1151.
67	15	18	αὐτὰρ ἐς ἠώ. i. 1151-1272: cf. 1169, 1172, 1186, 1231, 1255.
68	16	19	αὐτίκα δ' ἀκροτάτας ὑπερέσχεθεν ἀκριας ἀστὴρ ἦῶος. i. 1273-1359: cf. 1280, 1358.
69	17	20	ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἄητο ἦοῦς τελλομένης. i. 1359: ii. 163: cf. i. 1363: ii. 155.
70	18	21	ἦμος δ' ἠέλιος δροσεράς. ii. 164-176.
71	19	22	ἦματι δ' ἄλλῳ ἀντιπέρην. ii. 176-450: cf. 308, 428.

Day.	iii.	July	
72	20	23	αὐτίκα δ' οὐ μετὰ δηρὸν ἀμειβομένων ἐφαάνθη ἡριγενής. ii. 451-499: cf. 496.
73	21	24	ἦρι δ' ἐτήσιαι αἰραι ἐπέχραον. ii. 500-532: cf. 526-530.
	v.	Sept.	
113	1	2	ἐκ δὲ τόθεν μακάρεσσι. ii. 533-670: cf. 662.
114	2	3	ἦμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ' ἔπαυσε φάος. ii. 671-721: cf. 688. 702.
116	4	5	ἦμος δὲ τρίτατον φάος ἦλυθε. ii. 722-728.
117	5	6	ἦωθεν δ' ἀνέμοιο. ii. 729-900: cf. 762. 814. 839. 853-860.
128	17	17	ἦφοι δ' ἦπειτα δυωδεκάτῳ ἐπέβαινον ἡματι. ii. 901-944: cf. 942.
129	18	18	ἔνθεν δ' αὖτε Κάραμβιν ἄμ' ἠελίοιο βολῆσι. ii. 945-947.
130	19	19	αὐτίκα δ' Ἀσσυρίης ἐπέβαν χθονός. ii. 948-1002: cf. 962. 966. 972. 995.
131	20	20	ἡματι δ' ἄλλῳ νυκτί τ' ἐπιπλομένη. ii. 1002-1031.
132	21	21	ἡμάτιοι' λιαρὴ γὰρ ὑπὸ κνέφας. ii. 1034. 1032-1091. 1092-1123: cf. ii. 1099. 1104. 1123: iii. 320-327.
133	22	22	τὸ δὲ μυρίον ἐκ Διὸς ὕδωρ λῆξεν ἄμ' ἠελίῳ. ii. 1123-1231.
134	23	23	ἦρι δ' ἀνεγρομένοισιν. ii. 1232-1245: cf. 1235.
135	24	24	κεῖθεν δ' αὖ Μάκρωνας. ii. 1246-1249: cf. 1250-1255.
136	25	25	καὶ δὴ Καυκασίων ὄρεων ἀνέτελλον ἐρίπναι. ii. 1251. 1249-1288: cf. 1235. 1255. 1264.

Day.	v.	Sept.	
137	26	26	ἦώς δ' οὐ μετὰ δηρόν. ii. 1289-iii. 822 : cf. iii. 41. 537. 743. 798. 819.
138	27	27	τῆ δ' ἀσπασιον βάλει φέγγος ἠριγενής. iii. 822-1171 : cf. 737. 914. 921. 1137. 1142.
139	28	28	αὐτὰρ ἄμ' ἦοί πέμπον ἐς Αἰήτην. iii. 1171-1222 : cf. 1190. 1194. 1228.
140	29	29	ἦδη δὲ φόως νιφόντος ὑπερθε Καυκάσου ἠριγενής. iii. 1222-iv. 108 : cf. iii. 1339. 1406. 1041. 1245. 417 : iv. 6. 47. 54. 69. 70. 101.
141	30	30	ἦμος δ' ἀνέρες ὕπνον. iv. 109-240 : cf. 183.
	vi	Oct.	
143	2	2	ἦοί ἐνὶ τριτάτῃ. iv. 244. 241-252.

## PART II.

From the day of the passage of the gulf of Charybdis to the day of the landing at Pagasæ.

Day.	Month.	Mar.	
1	xi. 30	25	ἦμος δ' ἄκρον ἔβαλλε φαεσφόρος οὐρανὸν Ἥως. iv. 885-980 : cf. 841. 961.
2	xii. 1	26	ὄφρα καὶ αὖτις ἦώς ἠριγενής. iv. 980-1169 : cf. 1058. 1071. 1111. 1130.
3	2	27	ἦώς δ' ἀμβροσίοισιν ἀνερχομένη φαέεσσι. iv. 1170-1219.
9	8	April 2	ἦματι δ' ἐβδομάτῳ Δρεπάνην λίπον. iv. 1223-1231 : cf. 1219, 1220.  καὶ τότε ἀναρπάγδην .. .. ἐννέα πάσας νύκτας ὁμῶς καὶ τόσσα φέρ' ἦματα. iv. 1232-1295 : cf. 1289. 1304.
19	18	12	ἄκμηνοι καὶ ἄπαστοι ἐκείατο νύχθ' ὑπὸ πᾶσαν καὶ φάος. iv. 1295-1380 : cf. 1312.

<u>Day.</u>	<u>xii.</u>	April	
31	30	24	φῆρειν δυοκαίδεκα πάντα ἡμαθ' ὁμοῦ καὶ νύκτας. iv. 1386: cf. 1381-1536. 1396, 1397. 1436. 1479.
	i.		1502.
32	1	25	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐπὶ νηός. iv. 1537-1622: cf. 1540.
33	2	26	αὐτὰρ ἐς ἡῶ λαίφεσι πεπταμένοις. iv. 1622-1624.
34	3	27	ἦρι δ' ἔπειτ' ἀγκῶνα. iv. 1625-1634: cf. 1629. 1631.
35	4	28	παννύχιοι καὶ ἐπ' ἡμαρ. iv. 1634-1636.
36	5	29	ἔνθεν δ' οἷ γε περαιώσεσθαι ἔμελλον Κρήτην. iv. 1636-1690: cf. 1635. 1689.
37	6	30	μετὰ δ' οἷ γε νέον φαέθουσαν ἐς ἡῶ. iv. 1690-1713: cf. 1695.
		May	
38	7	1	αὐτίκα δ' Ἠῶς φέγγεν ἀνερχομένη. iv. 1713-1730.
39	8	2	ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κικέειθεν ὑπεύδια πείσματ' ἔλυσαν. iv. 1731-1764: cf. 1732.
40	9	3	κείθεν δ' ἀπτερέως, διὰ μυρίον οἶδμα λιπόντες. iv. 1765-1772.
41	10	4	ἀσπασίως ἀκτὺς Παγασῆϊδας εἰσαπέβητε. iv. 1781. 1773-1780.

SECTION X.—*Inferences from the preceding review, illustrative of the calendars or of the customs of classical antiquity.*

There are certain inferences derivable from the preceding review of the chronology of the Argonautica, which we think it desirable to point out, before we take our leave of this subject; because they are calculated to illustrate either the other calendars of the time besides the Rhodian, or the customs and usages of classical antiquity.

i. Lemnian calendar, in the time of Apollonius. It is an obvious conclusion from the Lemnian Episode that there

could have been no difference in the opinion of Apollonius between the calendar of Lemnos and that of the Argonauts; and if so, there could have been as little in his own time between the calendar of Lemnos and that of Rhodes. It is probable therefore that the Lemnian correction also originally was one of those which belonged to the same numerous family as the Rhodian, that of the Third Type of the Hellenic Octaëteris in general, Jan. 7, B. C. 542; and one of those too, which, at the end of the first Period of that Type, B. C. 382, like the Rhodian, adopted the Metonic correction, and transferred the beginning of the year from Jan. 7 or 8 to the date of the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή\*.

\* Among the characters introduced in the Thebais of Statius, Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas, king of Lemnos, and the contemporary of the Argonauts, is one. She appears there as the nurse of the infant Archemorus, whose untimely fate gives occasion to the institution of the Nemean games; and she is supposed to have been banished from Lemnos by the rest of the women, for saving the life of Thoas in the midst of the general destruction of the male population; twenty years before the expedition of the seven against Thebes. From the speech which Statius puts into her mouth, v. 29 sqq., it must be inferred that he reckoned the Lemnian year to have begun in the winter, as the Bœotian did, which, as we have seen supra, vol. ii. 329 sqq., he adopted for the chronology of his Poem. In this speech, the Lemnian woman (Polyxo here too, v. 327. 90.) who is supposed to have first conceived and proposed the idea of massacring the men, is made to say,

Atque adeo primum hoc mihi noscere detur,  
Tertia canet hyems, cui connubialia vincla,  
Aut thalami secretus honos? v. III.

And the year being meant by the hyems, we must suppose from this allusion that the year began in the winter. Shortly after the Argonauts arrive. Consequently in the spring: and they spend the rest of the year with the Lemnian women—i. e. not less than ten months—as may be inferred from the following allusion:

Jamque exuta gelu tepuerunt sidera longis  
Solibus, et velox in terga revolvitur annus:  
Jam nova progenies partusque in vota soluti,  
Et non speratis Lemnos clamatur alumnis. v. 459.

This describes the course of nature from the winter solstice first to the spring, and then round to the spring again—implying that the year began in the winter, but the arrival of the Argonauts took place in the spring—as their departure again at last also does—

ii. Date of the Samothracian mysteries. It is another observable coincidence that the arrival of the Argonauts at Samothrace is so contrived as to take place on the day of their departure from Lemnos, June 26, but on the evening of that day, the evening of June 27, the solstitial day, reckoned by the Grecian rule; and that their initiation in the mysteries takes place on the evening of their arrival too. This is sufficient to prove that the rule of the Noctidiurnal cycle was the same in Samothrace as everywhere else at first. We cannot doubt that all this was purposely contrived, and that the Lemnian Episode, among the other uses contemplated by it, was intended also for *this*, of detaining the Argonauts so long at Lemnos, that they should not arrive at Samothrace before the evening of their initiation: the evening of the summer solstitial day reckoned according to the primitive rule. The reason why the Argonauts should be initiated in these mysteries in particular, just after they had set out upon such a voyage as theirs, is explained by the common opinion of the Greeks, that those who had been initiated in these mysteries were safe from the danger of shipwreck. But the question is, whether the Samothracian mysteries were celebrated only once in the year, or more than once? For if they were celebrated only once, then this date of the initiation of the Argonauts ascertains the stated date of these mysteries in the time of Apollonius, June 27, the summer solstice, reckoned by the Grecian rule from the evening before. And if they were celebrated even more than once in the year, yet not oftener than once a month, or once

Detumere animi maris, et clementior Auster  
Vela vocat—

v. 468.

after a stay of ten months at least.

It is clear therefore that Statius assumed the Lemnian calendar to have been the same with the Bœotian of his time. Valerius Flaccus also, as we saw supra, (page 15,) by dating both the murder of the rest of the men, and the preservation of Thoas, at the Dionysia, would so far agree with Statius. Cf. v. 186–195. Neither of these representations is inconsistent with the fact which we are supposing, on the authority of the *Argonautica*, that the Lemnian calendar was originally the same with the Rhodian. Both these calendars began in the winter, as much as the Bœotian; and there was originally only six days' difference between their respective epochs.

every three months, still this same date, June 27, is ascertained as the stated date of one of these occasions at least—whether a monthly one, or a quarterly one: and in either of these cases alike this discovery may be of service towards the elucidation of the ancient Samothracian correction.

iii. Relation of the calendar of Kyzicus to the Rhodian; and date of the Parentalia to the Manes of Kyzicus there. Again, it has been seen that the Argonauts arrived at Kyzicus on the 25th of the second month, June 29, and left it again for the first time the next day, the 26th of the month, June 30; and were driven back to it again, and had their fatal encounter with the Doliones, in which Kyzicus fell, the same night—that of the 27th of the month, reckoned from sunset, June 30—July 1.

The mourning for Kyzicus, and for the rest who had fallen with him, began as soon as the mistake was discovered; i. e. on the following morning: and it lasted three days, including this as the first, before their funeral rites began to be celebrated.

Ἡῶθεν δ' ὄλοῃν καὶ ἀμήχανον εἰσενόησαν  
ἀμπλακίην ἄμφω<sup>o</sup>—  
ἡματα δὲ τρία πάντα γόων, τίλλοντό τε χαιτάς,  
αὐτοὶ ὁμῶς λαοὶ τε Δολιόυες· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα<sup>p κ'</sup>, τ. λ.

For that this last must be understood of the *fourth* day (the first after those three of mourning) appears from a similar notification, and on a similar occasion; that of the death and burial of Idmon among the Maryandyni<sup>q</sup>.

On this *fourth* day, when the funeral honours of Kyzicus were beginning, to add to the existing distress, Cleite, his newly-married wife, puts an end to her own existence<sup>r</sup>: on which Apollonius subjoins<sup>s</sup>—

Δινότατον δὴ κείνο Δολιονίησι γυναιξίν  
ἀνδράσι τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἡμάρ ἐπήλυθεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτῶν  
ἔτλη τις πάσασσθαι ἐδητύος, οὐδ' ἐπὶ δηρὸν,  
ἐξ ἀχέων, ἔργοιο μυληφάτου ἐμνώοντο·  
ἀλλ' αὐτως ἀφλεκτα διαζώεσκον ἔδοντες.  
ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν, εὐτ' ἄν σφιν ἐτήσια χύτλα χέωνται  
Κύζικον ἐνναίοντες Ἰάονες, ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ  
πανδήμοιο μύλης πελάνους ἐπαλετρεύουσιν.

<sup>o</sup> i. 1053.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. 1057.

<sup>q</sup> ii. 814: 817: 839.

<sup>r</sup> i. 1063–1069.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 1070.



That is, the day in question was observed at the time by all the Doliones, male and female, as a day of strict fast; and long after by a continued abstinence from bread-corn, dressed and prepared in the usual way: and for this reason, in imitation of the example so set on this first occasion, the Ionians settled in Kyzicus, (and Kyzicus was a colony of Miletus,) as often as the anniversary of the Parentalia of Kyzicus came round, still marked the day by eating upon it only bread of the coarsest and most unpalatable description; for that this is the proper meaning of *πέλανους* appears from the Scholia in loc.\*

Now the context determines this day to the lunar *τριακὰς*, the last day of the second month in the calendar followed by Apollonius; and the *τριακὰς* of the Greek lunar calendar, as we know from testimony †, was that day of the lunar month

\* Πέλανος δὲ ὁ διαπεπηγμένος καὶ ῥυπαρὸς (ἄρτος) κατὰ Ἀττικῶν. ὡς καὶ Εὐριπίδης

Στόματος ἀφρώδη πέλανον<sup>1</sup>.

φησὶ δὲ τοὺς ἀκαθάρτους καὶ εὐτελεῖς ἄρτους, οὓς ὁ Θεόκριτος Δωρικοὺς καλεῖ<sup>2</sup>—Πέλανον<sup>3</sup>. κυρίως πέλανος τὸ λεπτὸν πέμμα, ᾧ χρῶνται πρὸς τὰς θυσίας. ἔνιοι δὲ φασι καὶ πᾶν ἐξ ὑγροῦ πεπηγμένον, παρὰ τὸ παλῦναι—Πέλανοι<sup>4</sup>. πέμματά εἰσὶ τινα ποιά. Ἀττικοὶ δὲ πέλανον λέγουσι πᾶν τὸ πεπηγός—Πέλανοι<sup>5</sup>. πέμματα εἰς θυσίας ἐπιτήδεια—<sup>†</sup> Ἡ πέμμα τι πλακουντῶδες—Πέλανος<sup>6</sup>. πέψιν ἔχων ῥυπαράν—Πέλανος<sup>7</sup>. οὐ μόνον ὁ ῥύπος, ὡς καὶ Εὐριπίδης φησιν, ἀφρώδη πέλανον. . . ἀλλὰ καὶ θῦμά τι—Πέλανος κυρίως ὁ πεπηγὸς ῥύπος λέγεται—<sup>†</sup> Ὅμως δ' ἐπειδὴ<sup>8</sup>. πέλανος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐξυμωμένος καὶ πεπηγὸς πλακοῦς. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ ῥύπος—Πέλανος<sup>9</sup>. . . πολλάχις ἐστὶ τοῦνομα παρὰ πολλοῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων, Ἀπολλώνιος δ' ὁ Ἀχαρνέως ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἐορτῶν οὕτω γράφει· Ὅμοιοι δὲ καὶ ὁ προσαγορευόμενος πέλανος. λέγεται δὲ πέμματά τινα τοῖς θεοῖς γινόμενα ἐκ τοῦ ἀφαιρεθέντος σίτου, ἐκ τῆς ἄλω. Σαννυρίων δ' ἐν Γέλωπι φησὶ·

Πέλανον καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ θεοὶ

ἃ καλεῖτε σεμνῶς ἄλφιθ' ὑμεῖς οἱ βροτοί.

Δίδυμος δὲ κυρίως φησὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς παιπάλης πέμμα, ἐξ ἧς ποιοῦνται πέμματα κ', τ. λ.<sup>10</sup> Bread made of bran; bread of the coarsest description.

† Τριακάς<sup>1</sup>. τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἤγετο ἡ τριακοστὴ ἡμέρα διὰ (lege ἀπὸ) θανάτου, καὶ ἐλέγετο τριακάς<sup>2</sup>—Ἰδίως παρ' Ἀθηναίους καλοῦνται τριακάδες

1 Orestes, 220. 2 Scholia in loc.

3 Scholia in Orestem, 220=210.

4 Etym. M. 5 Hesychius.

6 Ibid.

7 Scholia in Æschyl. Persas, 201 and

202.

8 Ibid. ad vers. 519.

9 Harpocration.

10 Cf. Photius, Πέλανος and Πέλανοι: Suidas, Πέλανος: Πέλανοι.

1 Harpocration.

2 Cf. Photii Lex. τριακάς: Suidas, τριακάς.

in general which was devoted to parental services in memory of the dead in particular. There was consequently an evident propriety in dating this particular ceremony at Kyzicus, even in this first instance, on the *τριακὰς* of the month: on the supposition merely that the calendar of Kyzicus even at this time was lunar, as much as the calendar of the Argonauts\*. It proves also that there was no difference except

ἐπὶ τῶν τετελευτηκότων<sup>3</sup>—Περὶ τάφου· τριακάδες, γενέσια, νεκύσια<sup>4</sup>—Τριακάς<sup>5</sup>· ἡ τριακοστὴ τοῦ μηνός. καὶ σύστημά τι τῶν πολιτῶν—Ἐξω τριακάδος<sup>6</sup>· οἱ μὴ μεταλαμβάνοντες παῖδες ἢ ἀγχιστεῖς κλήρου τελευτήσαντός τινος Ἀθήνησιν ἐκαλεῖτο<sup>7</sup>—Τριακάδος· τὴν τριακοστὴν τῶν νεκρῶν<sup>8</sup>—Τὰς ἐν Ἄιδου τριακάδας<sup>9</sup>· τιμᾶται ἡ τριακὰς ἐν Ἄιδου διὰ τὴν Ἐκάτην μυστικώτερον. . . ὅθεν καὶ . . . τὰ νεκύσια τῇ τριακάδι ἄγεται—Καθέδραι<sup>10</sup>· πένθους ἡμέραι, ἐπὶ τετελευτηκόσι—Καθέδρα<sup>11</sup>· τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ τελευτήσαντος οἱ προσήκοντες συνελθόντες ἐδείπνουν ἐπὶ τῷ τελευτήσαντι κοινῇ. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καθέδρα, ὅτι καθεζόμενοι ἐδείπνουν καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα ἐπλήρουν—Καθέδραι<sup>12</sup>· ὑποδοχαὶ ἀνθρώπων. τῇ τριακοστῇ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἀποθανόντος οἱ προσήκοντες ἅπαντες καὶ ἀναγκαῖοι συνελθόντες κοινῇ ἐδείπνουν . . . καὶ τοῦτο καθέδρα ἐκαλεῖτο. ἦσαν δὲ καθέδραι τέσσαρες.—Τί τὸ παρ' Ἀργείοις λεγόμενον ἔγκλισμα; τοῖς ἀποβαλοῦσί τινα συγγενῶν ἢ συνηθῶν ἕθος ἐστὶ μετὰ πένθους εὐθὺς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι θύειν, ἡμέραις δὲ ὕστερον τριάκοντα τῷ Ἑρμῇ<sup>13</sup>—Ἐδοξε δέ μοι . . . τὸ πρόσωπον ἐψιμυθιωσθαι, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τεθνεώτος οὐπω τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας<sup>14</sup>.

\* The Julian date however of these first Parentalia to the Manes of Kyzicus, we observe, was July 4. Now this event of the death of Kyzicus, and possibly too in the way which is supposed in the Argonautica, may have been an historical incident—one of those which had characterised the actual voyage of Jason and his associates, whosoever they were, which, as we have already observed, must some time or other actually have taken place. The allusion to Cleite, as his newly-married wife, and to her untimely end, arising out of his death so soon after their marriage, may have been historical also. But if it was, then, when we consider the rule of these times to celebrate marriages in the first month of the primitive year, it will prove that this adventure of the true Argonauts with Kyzicus and the Doliones must have happened some time in the primitive Gamelion. Now let it be supposed the date of the actual voyage of this kind was about B. C. 1230; and that the traditionary date of the death of Kyzicus was July 4. On that principle, July 4, B. C. 1230, should turn out to be some day in the primitive Gamelion of the time being also. And so it

3 Pollux, i. vii. 6. 66.

4 Ibid. iii. 19. 102.

5 Hesychius. 6 Ibid.

7 Cf. in ἀτριακάστοι· ἐξεϊκάδιοι.

8 Anecdota, 308. 5.

9 Paroemiographi Græci, 112. e Cod.

10 Hesychius.

11 Photii Lex.

12 Anecdota, 268. 19.

13 Plutarch, *Quæstiones Græcæ*, xxiv.

14 Lysias, i. 14. De Cæde Erato-  
sthenis.

*per accidens*, and *pro tempore*, (under certain circumstances,) between the Rhodian calendar of Apollonius' time and the Kyzikene of the same time; as neither indeed was there. The third Callippic period of the Kyzikene calendar bore date October 1, B. C. 230; and the third Callippic period of the Rhodian, May 6, B. C. 230: and October 1 was the date of the sixth month in the Rhodian calendar that year, and May 6 was the date of the ninth in the Kyzikene<sup>t</sup>: so that there could have been no difference between them at this time but what was purely accidental and temporary.

We may infer then that the anniversary of the Parentalia, still celebrated at Kyzicus to the memory of Kyzicus in Apollonius' time\*, was the *τριακὰς* of that month in the Kyzikene calendar, which corresponded to the *τριακὰς* of the second month in the Rhodian; and this must have been the *τριακὰς* of the Kyzikene month *Καλαμαιῶν*<sup>v</sup>, which corresponded to *Σκιρροφοριῶν* in the Attic, *Πάναμος* in the Rhodian, calendar.

iv. Consecration of the Lunar Numenæ to all the gods. On the 113th day of the action, just when the Argonauts were resuming their voyage after the cessation of the Etesian winds, the first thing which they are supposed to do is to build an altar to the twelve gods, and to offer sacrifice upon it, and then to set sail<sup>x</sup>.

was. The first of the primitive Thoth or primitive Gamelon, Æra 2777, was June 23, B. C. 1230; and July 4 was the 12th. On this principle too the voyage of these Argonauts might have begun in May, towards the end of that month, or the beginning of the next; and if it was completed by their return, at the end of September, that would explain and account for the tradition that it lasted four months in all. These four months would be June, July, August, and September.

\* That is, what is called *χύτρα*, of which see the Schol. ad i. 1075. The proper sense of *χύτρα* was that of a mixture of oil and water: cf. Hesychius, *Χύτρα· τὰ μετ' ἐλαίου καὶ ὕδατος ἀλείμματα*—*Τὸ ἐφ' ὕδατος ἔλαιον*: cf. Etym. M. *χυτλῶσαι*. But it was used in the sense of *ἐναγίσματα* also, in which it was synonymous with *χοαί*: Etym. Mag. *Χύτρα· κυρίως εἰσὶ τὰ μεθ' ὕδατος ἔλαια. καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐναγίσματα. οἶον,*

*χύτρα δὲ οἱ χεύναντο καὶ ἤγγισαν ἔντομα μῆλων.*

Cf. Apollon. Rhod. ii. 928, and the Schol. ad i. 1075.

<sup>t</sup> See vol. iii. 350.

<sup>v</sup> See vol. iii. 342. 350.

<sup>x</sup> ii. 533.

Ἐκ δὲ τόθεν μακάρεσσι δωδέκα δωμήσαντες  
 βωμὸν ἀλὸς ῥήγμινι πέρην, καὶ ἐφ' ἱερά θέντες,  
 νῆα θοὴν εἰσβαίνον.

The Julian date of this day was Sept. 2; the luna prima of the fifth month in the Rhodian calendar, B. C. 230, the first of Carneius. Consequently it was strictly the numenia. It illustrates therefore the estimation of the numenia, or first day of the lunar months in the calendar of the time being, as sacred, not to one of the gods of Olympus in particular, but to all in common<sup>y</sup>. That an altar, supposed to have been raised and dedicated to the twelve gods, by Jason, and the Argonauts, was actually pointed out in this locality, appears from other sources<sup>z</sup>; that it was erected on this day, and the first sacrifice, offered upon it, was offered on this day, is supposed by Apollonius, κατ' οἰκονομίαν—in order to fall in with the commonly received repute of the first of the lunar month, as sacred to all the gods.

v. Date of the appearance of Apollo Ἐῶος; and Lycian calendar of Apollonius' time. On the morning after this day, September 3 in the Julian, the 2nd of the fifth month, in the Rhodian calendar of the time being, and just as the day was beginning to dawn, the poet supposes a manifestation of Apollo, on his way from Lycia through the air to the country of the Hyperboreans—

Ἦμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ πω φάος ἄμβροτον οὔτε τι λίην  
 ὀρφναίη πέλεται, λεπτόν δ' ἐπιδέδρομε νυκτὶ  
 φέγγος, ὅτ' ἀμφιλύκην μιν ἀνεγρόμενοι καλέουσι·  
 τῆμος ἐρημαίης νήσου λιμέν' εἰσελάσαντες  
 Θυνιάδος καμάτῳ παμπήμονι βαῖνον ἔραζε.  
 τοῖσι δὲ Λητοῦς υἱὸς, ἀνερχόμενος Λυκίηθεν  
 τῆλ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα δῆμον Ὑπερβορέων ἀνθρώπων,  
 ἐξεφάνη<sup>a</sup>.

There can be no doubt concerning the date of this vision; the 114th day of the action, the day after the departure from Salmydessus and the passage through the Symplegades; the second of the lunar month, the third of the Julian September. It had nothing therefore to do with the day properly sacred to Apollo; which would have required it to have

<sup>y</sup> See vol. i. 264 note.

<sup>z</sup> See Geographi Min. iii : Dionys. Byz. De Bosphoro, pag. 16 : Aiunt hic Jasonem litasse duodecim diis, (at the

Fanum Asiaticum, not far from the river Chrysorrhoas.)

<sup>a</sup> ii. 671.

been determined to the 7th of the month. And though it leads to the construction of an altar to Apollo, under the title of *ἑῶος*<sup>b</sup>—and an altar so dedicated, and ascribed to the Argonauts, as we learn from the testimony of Herodotus, quoted by the Scholiast in loco, was still pointed out on the island *Θυνιάς*<sup>c</sup>, or *Θυνίη*—that will not explain the date assigned to both these things—nor why Apollo should have been supposed to have been on his way to the country of the Hyperboreans from Lycia in particular, and on this day in particular, when he was thus revealed to the eyes of the Argonauts. The true explanation is probably to be found in the Lycian calendar of Apollonius' time, which this date of his may some time or other be found to illustrate.

vi. Calendar of Coreyra in the time of Apollonius; and date of the sacrifice founded by Medea in Coreyra. The judgment of Alkinous, and the marriage of Jason and Medea, at Coreyra, are supposed to have been commemorated by the institution of an annual sacrifice to the *Parcæ* and the Nymphs by Medea, kept up there ever after;

*Μοιράων δ' ἔτι κείσε θύη ἐπέτεια δέχονται  
καὶ Νυμφέων Νομίσι καθ' ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος  
βωμοῖ, τοὺς Μήδεια καθίστατο*<sup>d</sup>—

Timæus, quoted by the Scholiast, throws much light on this part of the *Argonautica*: *Τίμαιος δὲ ἐν Κερκίρᾳ λέγων γενέσθαι τοὺς γάμους καὶ περὶ τῆς θυσίας ἱστορεῖ, ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγων ἄγεσθαι αὐτὴν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν, Μηδείας πρώτου θυσίας ἐν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερῷ. καὶ βωμοὺς δὲ φησι μνημεῖα τῶν γάμων ἰδρῦσασθαι, σύνεγγυς μὲν τῆς θαλάσσης οὐ μακρὰν δὲ τῆς πόλεως. ὀνομάζουσι δὲ τὸν μὲν Νυμφῶν τὸν δὲ Νηρηίδων. ὃ γε μὴν Ἀπολλώνιος τὸν μὲν φησι Νυμφῶν εἶναι τὸν βωμὸν, τὸν δὲ τῶν Μοιρῶν.* It is not indeed clear whether the date of the celebration of the first sacrifice of this kind was the morning of the departure from Coreyra, or that of the day after the marriage; but the latter is most probable, as the institution of the sacrifice arose out of the marriage, and out of the judgment of Alkinous, and it was appointed to be offered in the temple of Apollo the lawgiver, as ultimately the author of that judgment too: *Διὰ τὸ κατὰ νόμον γενέσθαι τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ Ἀλκιούου, διὰ τοῦτο Νομίον Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἰδρῦσασθαι τὴν Μήδειαν.*

<sup>b</sup> ii. 688-695-702.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 675-723. cf. i. 350.

<sup>d</sup> iv. 1217.

The day of the arrival at Coreyra then having been March 26, the first of the xiith month; the date of this annual sacrifice was probably the second of the lunar month, both in the Rhodian calendar, and in the Coreyræan, of Apollonius' time. And this will imply that these calendars in his time were so far the same. We have seen reason to conclude that the Coreyræan calendar belonged originally to the same type of the Octaëteric correction as the Bœotian<sup>e</sup>. But if the Coreyræan was Metonic in Apollonius' time, as well as the Rhodian, and its epoch like the Bœotian, Jan. 14, B. C. 407, there would be no difference between this calendar, Period iii. 26, and the Rhodian, Period iii. 1, B. C. 230; May 6, the first of the first month in the latter would be the first of the fifth in the former.

vii. Calendar of Anaphe, and date of the sacrifice to Apollo Αἰγλήτης. The Argonauts, still on their return, no sooner set sail from Crete, than they encountered a violent storm<sup>f</sup>—

Αὐτίκα δὲ Κρηταῖον ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θέοντας  
νύξ ἐφόβει, τὴν πέρ τε κατουλάδα κικλήσκουσι,  
νύκτ' ὀλοήν. οὐκ ἄστρα διῖσχανεν· οὐδ' ἀμαρυγαὶ  
μήνης· οὐρανόθεν δὲ μέλαν χάος, ἧέ τις ἄλλη  
ᾠώρει σκοτίη, μυχίων ἀνιοῦσα βερέθρων.

The interposition of this storm serves no purpose, as far as we can discover, but that of leading to the invocation of Apollo; and through his intervention, and the flashing of his bow across the surrounding darkness, the discovery of the small island of Anaphe, on which the Argonauts took refuge: and where, to commemorate the mode of their deliverance, they founded an altar, and instituted a sacrifice to Apollo, surnamed Αἰγλήτης, or the flasher<sup>g</sup>.

Μαρμαρέην δ' ἀπέλαμψε βιὸς περὶ πάντοθεν αἴγλην,  
τοῖσι δὲ τις Σποράδων βαιὴ ἀπὸ τόφρ' ἐφαάνθη  
νῆσος ἰδεῖν, ὀλίγης Ἰππουρίδος ἀντία νήσου,  
ἔνθ' εὐνάς ἐβάλοντο καὶ ἔσχεθον· αὐτίκα δ' ἡὼς  
φέγγεν ἀνερχομένη· τοὶ δ' ἀγλαὸν Ἀπόλλωνι  
ἄλσει ἐνὶ σκιερῷ τέμενος σκιδεύτᾳ τε βωμὸν

<sup>e</sup> See vol. ii. 665.

<sup>f</sup> iv. 1604.

<sup>g</sup> iv. 1699–1730. cf. Phot. Bibl. Codex, 186. pag. 130. Conon. Διηγῆσ. xlix: also Orpheus, Argonautica, 1364—

Παῖαν δ' ἄρ' ἐκηβόλος ἀγρόθι ναίων  
Δήλου ἀπὸ κραναῆς ἦκεν βέλος, ἐκ δ' ἀνέφηθεν  
μεσσάτιον Σποράδων· Ἀνάφη δέ ἐ πάντες ὀπίσσω  
νῆσον κικλήσκουσι περικτίονες ἄνθρωποι.

ποίηον Αἰγλήτην<sup>h</sup> μὲν, εὐσκοπόπου εἵνεκεν αἰγλης,  
 Φοῖβον κεκλόμενοι· Ἀνάφην δέ τε λισσαδά νῆσον  
 ἴσκον, ὃ δὴ Φοῖβός μιν ἀτυζομένοις ἀνέφηνε<sup>i</sup>.

It is clear then that this incident too must have been altogether κατ' οἰκονομίαι—having no end in view but that of explaining an historical fact, the name of the island, and the foundation of the sacrifice to Apollo αἰγλήτης there—both which tradition connected with the adventures of the Argonauts. Now they landed on this island, and built the altar, and offered the first sacrifice, on the 38th day of the return, the 7th of the first Rhodian month, the 1st of the Julian May. If so, on the day sacred to Apollo himself. We may conclude from this coincidence, that the stated date of this ceremony in the calendar of Anaphe, as still kept up in Apollonius' time, was the 7th of the month in that too—and the 7th of some month which corresponded to the seventh of the first month in the Rhodian calendar, the seventh of the Rhodian Artamitius; and if so, to the 7th of the Attic Thargelion, or some corresponding day in that—which is another observable coincidence.

The storm encountered in this instance began in the evening—the evening of the lunar sixth *eveunte*, or the seventh *ineunte*—and by midnight, at that period of the month, the moon would be set; so that, if the storm was allayed by the appearance of Apollo just before morning<sup>k</sup>, the worst part of it must have been after midnight: which accounts for the allusion to the absence of moonlight, as well as of the light of the stars, in the description of the storm. We learn from the same description the proper sense of a νύξ κατουλᾶς\*

\* Σκοτεινὴ νύξ, says the Scholiast, κατουλᾶς καλεῖται παρὰ τὸ ὀλοῦν. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ναυπιάτῳ (Ναυπλία) νυκτὶ κατουλάδι. Phot. Lex. Κατουλάδα. Σοφοκλῆς Ναυπλιάτῳ·

Ἐπεύχομαι δὲ νυκτὶ τῇ κατουλάδι.

... οἱ δὲ τῇ πανωλέθρῳ ἐσομένη τοῖς Ἑλλησιν· οὐλον γὰρ τὸ ὀλέθριον ... ἣ ζοφώδη, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸ σῶμα γινομένης οὐλῆς (a wound) μελαντέρα γάρ· ἣ καταγιγῆδας ἔχουσιν καὶ συστροφᾶς ἀνέμων. Hesychius, Κατουλάδα· τὴν κατ' ἰλλουσαν καὶ εἴργουσαν· βέλτιον δὲ τὴν κατ' ὀλεθρον ἢ ζοφώδη, καὶ συστροφᾶς ἔχουσιν ἀνέμων—Κατειλάδα· ἡμέραν χειμερινήν—Κηλᾶς... χειμερινὴ ἡμέρα. Etym. M. Κατουλᾶς· καλεῖται ἢ σκοτεινὴ νύξ, διὰ τὸ ὀλοῦν αὐτὴν εἶναι. οἶον,

Νύξ ἐφόβει, τὴν πέρ τε κατουλάδα κικλήσκουσιν.

<sup>h</sup> Hesychius, Αἰγλήτην· ἐπίθετον Ἀπόλλωνος.

<sup>i</sup> iv. 1711.

<sup>k</sup> 1713.

—a night, the most characteristic circumstance of which was the intensity of the darkness—which could never have been greater, under the circumstances of the case, than just after midnight.

viii. Date of the Ὑδροφόρια at Ægina. Lastly, from the concluding particulars of the return we may collect the date of the Ὑδροφόρια at Ægina; a contest in running, the candidates in which carried pitchers of water on their shoulders, supposed to be in imitation of what the Argonauts had done, when they too landed in Ægina to renew their supply of water, and the wind and the weather both favouring the continuance of their voyage, had vied with each other which should get through his part of their task soonest.

Αἶψα δὲ τοί γε

ὕδρειης πέρι δῆριν ἀμεφέα δηρίσσαντο,  
ὅς κεν ἀφυσσάμενος φθαίη μετὰ νῆάδ' ἰκέσθαι.  
ἄμφω γὰρ χρειώ τε, καὶ ἄσπετος οὖρος ἔπειγεν.  
ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν πλήθοντας ἐπωμαδὸν ἀμφιφορῆας  
ἀνθέμενοι, κούφοισιν ἄφαρ κατ' ἀγῶνα πόδεσσι  
κοῦροι Μυρμιδόνων νίκης πέρι δηριόωνται<sup>1</sup>.

The date of this landing is determined to the 40th day of the return, the 9th of the Rhodian Artamitius, May 3. Such then must have been the date of the Ὑδροφόρια in the Æginetan calendar also; the 9th of the month which corresponded to the Rhodian Artamitius. That this conclusion is correct appears from the fact otherwise known, that the month of the Ὑδροφόρια in the Æginetan calendar was Delphinus\*:

\* Scholia in Pindar. ad Nem. v. 81. Μεῖς ἐπιχώριος ὁ Δελφίνιος μὴν καλούμενος, καθ' ὃν τελεῖται Ἀπόλλωνος ἀγὼν Ὑδροφόρια καλούμενος. It is here to be observed, that though this contest in Ægina must certainly have been called the Ὑδροφόρια also, its more appropriate name was that of the ἀγὼν ἀμφορίτης: Schol. ad Pind. Olymp. vii. 156. Αἰγινά τε . . . Ἐν δ' Αἰγίνῃ τὰ Αἰάκεια. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀμφορίτης ἀγὼν, οὗ Καλλιμαχος μέμνηται ἐν τοῖς Ἰάμβοις (Fr. 80)—The Etym. M. calls it Ἀμφιφορίτης. Ὅτι ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἔδραμον περὶ τὴν Ἀσωπίδα κρήνην ὑδρεύσασθαι. ὅθεν καὶ ἀγὼν ἄγεται ἀμφιφορίτης λεγόμενος παρὰ τοῖς Αἰγινήταις, ἐν ᾧ οἱ ἐκείσε ἀγωνιζόμενοι τοὺς κεράμους ὕδατος πεπληρωμένους ἀναλαβόντες κατὰ τῶν ὤμων τρέχουσι, περὶ τῆς νίκης φιλονεικούντες, κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἥρώων. ἀμφιφορεὺς γὰρ . . ὑδρία.

The ὑδροφόρια is explained also as a ceremony of a parental nature, in memory of those who perished at the Deluge. Hesychius, Ὑδροφόρια



and the Æginetan Delphinus, as we have seen<sup>m</sup>, corresponded to the Attic Thargelion. So did the Rhodian Artamitius, as we saw supra<sup>n</sup>. They must therefore have corresponded to each other. There can be little doubt, in fact, that the Æginetan correction was one of the third Type, as much as the Rhodian; and it is very probable that it was Metonic in Apollonius' time as much as the Rhodian—and not impossible (though we cannot be certain about that), that it might be beginning at the Πλειάδων ἐπιτολή, as well as the Rhodian.

ἐορτὴ πένθιμος Ἀθήνησι. Cf. Phot. Lex. Ὑδροφόρια ἐορτὴ πένθιμος Ἀθήνησιν, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ ἀπολομένοις. ὡς Ἀπολλώνιος. Cf. Suidas, and Etym. M., in voce: Harpocration in Πελανός.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. ii. 682. Fragmentary Calendars.

<sup>n</sup> Page 195.

## DISSERTATION VIII.

### *On the Parthenian Ennead of the Boeotians.*

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *On the Daphnephoria and Parthenia of the ancient Boeotians.*

###### SECTION I.—*Testimonies.*

THE Daphnephoria and the Parthenia of the Boeotians were only different names for the same ceremony; the former taken from the branches of laurel carried on the occasion, the latter from the songs chanted by chorusses of virgins. The historical account of its origin has come down, in an extract of Photius' from the Chrestomathia of Proclus; which we shall lay before the reader.

Τὰ δὲ λεγόμενα Παρθένια χοροῖς Παρθένων ἐνεγράφετο, οἷς καὶ τὰ δαφνηφορικὰ ὡς εἰς γένος πίπτει. δάφνας γὰρ ἐν Βοιωτία δι' ἐννεατηρίδος εἰς τὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος κομίζοντες οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐξύμνου αὐτὸν διὰ χοροῦ παρθένων. καὶ ἡ αἰτία—

Τῶν Αἰολέων, ὅσοι κατόκουν Ἄρνην καὶ τὰ ταύτη χωρία, κατὰ χρησμὸν ἀναστάντες ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ προσκαθεζόμενοι Θήβας, ἐπόρθουν προκατεχομένας ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν. κοινῆς ἀμφοῖν ἑορτῆς Ἀπόλλωνος ἐνστάσης ἀνοχὰς ἔθεντο, καὶ δάφνας τεμύοντες οἱ μὲν ἐξ Ἑλικῶν οἱ δὲ ἐγγὺς τοῦ Μέλανος ποταμοῦ ἐκόμιζον τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. Πολεμάτας δὲ ὁ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ἀφηγούμενος ἔδοξεν ὄναρ νεανίαν τινὰ πανοπλίαν αὐτῷ διδόναι, καὶ εὐχὰς ποιῆσθαι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι δαφνηφοροῦντας διὰ ἐννεατηρίδος προστάττειν. μετὰ δὲ τρίτην ἡμέραν ἐπιθέμενος κρατεῖ τῶν πολεμίων· καὶ αὐτὸς τε τὴν δαφνηφορίαν ἐτέλει, καὶ τὸ ἔθος ἐκεῖθεν διατηρεῖται.

Ἡ δὲ δαφνηφορία—ξύλον ἐλαίας καταστέφουσι δάφναις καὶ ποικίλοις ἄνθεσι. καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρον μὲν χαλκῇ ἐφαρμόζεται σφαῖρα, ἐκ δὲ ταύτης μικροτέρας ἐξαρτῶσι· κατὰ δὲ τὸ μέσον τοῦ ξύλου περιθέντες ἐλάσσοι τῆς ἐπ' ἄκρῳ σφαίρας καθάπτουσι πορφυρᾷ στέμματα. τὰ

δὲ τελευταία τοῦ ξύλου περιστέλλουσι κροκωτῶ. βούλεται δ' αὐτοῖς ἡ μὲν ἀνωτάτω σφαῖρα τὸν ἥλιον, ᾧ καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἀναφέρουσιν· ἡ δὲ ὑποκειμένη τὴν σελήμην, τὰ δὲ προσηρτισμένα τῶν σφαιρίων ἄστρα τε καὶ ἀστέρας· τὰ δὲ γε στέμματα τὸν ἐνιαύσιον ὁρόμον. καὶ γὰρ καὶ τξέ' ποιοῦσιν αὐτά.

Ἄρχει δὲ τῆς δαφνηφορίας παῖς ἀμφιθαλής. καὶ ὁ μάλιστα αὐτῷ οἰκεῖος βαστάζει τὸ κατεστημένον ξύλον, ὃ Κωπῶ καλοῦσιν. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δαφνηφόρος ἐπόμενος τῆς δάφνης ἐφάπτεται, τὰς μὲν κόμας καθειμένος, χρυσοῦν δὲ στέφανον φέρων, καὶ λαμπρὰν ἐσθῆτα ποδιήρη ἐστολισμένον, Ἰφικρατίδας τε ὑποδεδεμένος· ᾧ χορὸς παρθένων ἐπακολουθεῖ, προτείνων κλῶνας πρὸς ἰκετηρίαν τῶν ὕμνων. παρέμπουν δὲ τὴν δαφνηφορίαν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰσμηρίου καὶ Χαλαζίου<sup>ο</sup>.

It thus appears that the local tradition of the Bœotians (perpetuated by this ceremony to the time of Proclus) attributed its institution to the leader of the Æolian colony, which some time or other settled at Thebes. That the Bœotians belonged to the Æolian branch of the Hellenic community in general, is well known<sup>p</sup>. This colony, the same account implied, came to Bœotia from Arne; but from what Arne is not specified. There was however an Ἄρνη in Thessaly, which also was said to have been founded by a Bœotian colony<sup>r</sup>: Τέσσαρες δὲ Ἄρναι ἀριθμοῦνται τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἐν αἷς καὶ Θεσσαλικῇ, ἄποικος τῆς Βοιωτίας, περὶ ἧς ἐχρήσθη οὕτως·

Ἄρνη χηρεύουσα μένει Βοιώτιον ἄνδρα—

Ἄρνη<sup>s</sup> .... δευτέρα, πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ἄποικος τῆς Βοιωτίας κ', τ. λ. called also Κιέριον—Ἄρνη πόλις Βοιωτίας· ἔστι δὲ καὶ Θεσσαλίας<sup>t</sup>. It might therefore always have been conjectured from the preceding account that, if these ancestors of the Bœotians, who got possession of Thebes on this occasion, came from some Ἄρνη, it must have been from Ἄρνη in Thessaly; and consequently that the institution of the *Δαφνηφορία* which, according to tradition, arose out of the conquest of Thebes, must have coincided with this coming from Arne in Thessaly.

<sup>ο</sup> Photius, Bibliotheca, Codex 239. pag. 321. l. 33 a. Cf. Schol. in Clem. Alex. Protrepticon, pag. 94. l. 9. ad *Δάφνης*. Also, *Histor. Aug. SS. J. Capitolinus*, M. Anton. Phil. 2. and *Trebellius Pollio*, *Triginta Tyranni*, xxi. *Æmilianus*—*Eutychius Proculus*, or

*Proclus*, of *Sicca*—there mentioned, as some suppose—though this *Proculus* seems to have written in Latin.

<sup>p</sup> Cf. vol. ii. 296.

<sup>r</sup> *Eustathius*, ad *Iliad*. B. 507. 270. 31.

<sup>s</sup> *Steph. Byz.*

<sup>t</sup> *Hesychius*: cf. *Etym. M.* Ἄρνη.

And that being assumed, it is in our power, by means of the time of this coming, to determine that of the institution.

SECTION II.—*On the return of the Bœotians to Thebes, from Arne in Thessaly; and its time.*

Βοιωτοί τε γὰρ οἱ νῦν, ἐξηκοστῷ ἔτει μετὰ Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ἐξ Ἄρνης ἀναστάντες ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν, τὴν νῦν μὲν Βοιωτίαν πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην ᾤκισαν. ἦν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποδοασμὸς πρότερον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ, ἀφ' ᾧν καὶ ἐς Ἰλιον ἐστράτευσαν.\*

It thus appears that Thucydides dated some settlement of the Bœotians at Thebes, in the 60th year after the capture of Troy; and that these Bœotians were previously living in Arne of Thessaly. And with this statement of his, we should by all means compare the following of Strabo's; which does not seem to have been taken from it, yet throws much light upon it<sup>w</sup>: 'Ἡ δὲ οὖν Βοιωτία πρότερον μὲν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ᾤκείτο, Ἄδων<sup>x</sup> καὶ Τεμμίκων<sup>y</sup> ἐκ τοῦ Σουνίου πεπλανημένων, καὶ Λελέγων, καὶ Ὑάντων· εἶτα Φοίνικες ἔσχον οἱ μετὰ Κάδμου, ὃς τὴν τε Καδμείαν ἐτείχισε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις ἀπέλιπεν. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τὰς Θήβας τῇ Καδμείᾳ προσέκτισαν, καὶ συνέφύλαξαν τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἡγούμενοι τῶν πλείστων Βοιωτῶν, ἕως τῆς τῶν Ἐπιγόνων στρατείας. κατὰ δὲ τούτους ὀλίγον χρόνον ἐκλιπόντες τὰς Θήβας ἐπανῆλθον πάλιν. ὡς δ' αὐτῶς ὑπὸ Θρακῶν καὶ Πελασγῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐν Θετταλία συνεστήσαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν μετὰ Ἀρναίων ἐπὶ πολλὸν χρόνον, ὥστε καὶ Βοιωτοὺς κληθῆναι ἅπαντας. εἶτ' ἀνέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ἣδη τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ στόλου παρεσκευασμένου περὶ Αὐλῖδα τῆς Βοιωτίας, ὃν ἔστελλον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν οἱ τοῦ Ὀρέστου παῖδες. προσθέντες δὲ τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ τὴν Ὀρχομενίαν (οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κοινῇ πρότερον, οὐδ' Ὅμηρος μετὰ Βοιωτῶν αὐτοὺς κατέλεξεν, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ, Μινύας προσαγορεύσας) μετ' ἐκείνων ἐξέβαλον τοὺς μὲν Πελασγοὺς εἰς Ἀθήνας, ἀφ' ᾧν ἐκλήθη μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως Πελασγικόν· ᾤκησαν δὲ ὑπὸ τῷ Ὑμητῷ· τοὺς δὲ Θρακᾶς εἰς τὸν Παρνασσόν. Ὑαντες δὲ τῆς Φωκίδος Ὑάμπολιν ᾤκισαν.

We learn from this testimony that the occupation of Thebes on this occasion was strictly a return of the Bœotians to their own country, of which they had been dispossessed; and

<sup>v</sup> Thucydides, i. 12. cf. the Schol. in loc.

<sup>w</sup> ix. 1. 248 b.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. Lycophron, 1209; Callimachus, Hymnus in Delum, 75; Apoll. Rhod.

iii. 1177. and the Scholia: Eustathius, ad Dionys. Perieg. 476; Virgil, Eclog. vi. 65; x. 12.

<sup>y</sup> Cf. Lycophron, 644.

that, as they had taken refuge at Arne, in Thessaly, after that dispossession, so they came back from Arne before this reoccupation. We learn too that they had been expelled at first by an inroad of Pelasgians, as Strabo calls them, and other barbarians; and this too must do much to identify this return from Arne, according to Strabo, with that which preceded the institution of the *Δαφνηφορία*, according to Proclus, Thebes being in the occupation of the Pelasgi at the time, according to both.

We learn also from this testimony of Strabo's, that the time of this return coincided with that of the Æolic migration; and so critically, that the expedition had been assembled at Aulis, and was ready to set out, when the return took place; and what is more, (as appears from the sequel of the passage<sup>z</sup>) when it set sail at last, some of the Bœotians, who came back on this occasion, accompanied it. We learn also, from the same account, that this colony to Asia was conducted by Penthilus, the son of Orestes; and this implies that Orestes was dead, for the colony was first projected by Orestes, and preparations for it began to be made in his lifetime. And as he did not die under fifty or sixty years at least after the capture of Troy<sup>a</sup>, (as we hope to see more clearly hereafter,) the colony consequently could not have been less than fifty or sixty years later than the capture of Troy. Accordingly, in another passage of Strabo's, it is dated 60 years after the capture<sup>b</sup>: *Ἐτρασι γὰρ δὴ γενεαῖς πρεσβυτέραν φασὶ τὴν Αἰολικὴν ἀποικίαν τῆς Ἰωνικῆς διατριβὰς δὲ λαβεῖν καὶ χρόνους μακροτέρους. Ὁρέστην μὲν γὰρ ἄρξαι τοῦ στολῶν τούτου δ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τελευτήσαντος τὸν βίον, διαδέξασθαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πένθιλον, καὶ προελθεῖν μέχρι Θράκης, ἐξήκοντα ἔτεσι τῶν Τρωϊκῶν ὕστερον, ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν εἰς Πελοπόννηπον κάθοδον κ', τ. λ.*

The agreement between the date of this migration, according to Strabo, and that of the return of the Bœotians, according to Thucydides, is remarkable; and if neither was taken from the other, it could have been produced only by the truth of the fact, and a correct chronology of each of these events. It does not appear that this statement in

<sup>z</sup> ix. 1. 250 b.

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Mr. Clinton, F. H. i. 103, 104, and note n.

<sup>b</sup> xiii. 1. 81 a. b.

Strabo was founded on that in Thucydides. There is no allusion to the Æolic migration in the latter, nor anything about the return of the Bœotians in the former—which assigns the date of the migration—and only a very general allusion in the preceding passage, which attests the coincidence between the return and the migration, but assigns the date of neither. We may presume then that Strabo's statements on one of these points were entirely independent of that of Thucydides on the other; and that if the date of each of these events, as referrible to the æra of Troy, happened to be the same, it was a coincidence produced by the course of things and the matter of fact\*. Assuming then that the date of one of them, the

\* The passage quoted from Proclus ascribed the migration of the Æolians on that occasion, from Arne, in Thessaly, to Bœotia, to an oracle (no doubt of the Delphian Apollo); Thucydides to their having been expelled by the Thessalians. There is no inconsistency between these different accounts, at least if it may be supposed that these Bœotians, having been expelled from Arne, both sought and obtained the directions of the oracle, where they should settle again. That tradition connected the return of the Bœotians with an oracle appears from other allusions to it<sup>1</sup>.

The account of Proclus also seems to restrict the return on this occasion simply to the reoccupation of Thebes. But that is no necessary inference from it; and it may be collected from other references to the same event, that it must have been something much more general, a reoccupation of the *whole* of Bœotia. It appears from Strabo<sup>2</sup> that Coronea was reoccupied on this occasion; and from Herodotus<sup>3</sup>, that Tanagra was so; and it is still more clear from Plutarch's Kimon<sup>4</sup> that Chæronea must have been so: Περιπόλτας ὁ μάντις, ἐκ Θετταλίας εἰς Βοιωτίαν Ὀφέλταν τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ λαοὺς καταγαγὼν, γένος εὐδοκίμησαν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς χρόνους κατέλιπεν· οὗ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ κατόκησεν, ἣν πρώτην πόλιν ἔσχον, ἐξέλασαντες τοὺς βαρβάρους. Chæronea was Plutarch's native city. And he proceeds to tell a remarkable story concerning a certain Damon, a lineal descendant of this Peripoltas, and called after him too, who lived in the time of Lucullus, one or two hundred years before himself.

It would seem too, from Thucydides, as if all the Bœotians had been expelled from their own country, before the Trojan expedition, excepting an *ὑποδασμὸς*, as he styles it, which furnished the Bœotian contingent to the expedition. But this, according to Homer, was much too considerable to have been supplied by a small part only of the whole Bœotian community. He reckons from Bœotia, under their two leaders, Peneleus and Leitus<sup>5</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Schol. in Arist. ad Plutum, 604. (pag. 205) ἐς κόρακας: ad Nubes, 133: Suidas, Ἐς κόρακας: Etym. M. ἀπεσκοράκισεν.

<sup>2</sup> ix. 2. 265 a.

<sup>3</sup> v. 57. 61.

<sup>4</sup> Cap. I.

<sup>5</sup> Iliad B. 494-510.

return of the Bœotians to their own country, in Thucydides' reckoning of the æra of Troy, did coincide with the 60th year from the capture, the next question for our consideration is Thucydides' date of the capture of Troy.

SECTION III.—*Thucydides' date of the Capture of Troy.*

The date of the capture of Troy is not found in any part of Thucydides, in so many words. It is observable however

not less than 50 ships, with a crew of 120 men each, 6000 in all, furnished by 29 cities. It is observable however that even he speaks of none from Thebes, only from 'Υποθήβαι—

Οἱ θ' Ὑποθήβας εἶχον, εὐκτίμενον πολίεθρον<sup>6</sup>.

i. e. as the Scholiast explained, the dependencies of Thebes, the parts about Thebes, the suburbs of Thebes: τὰς ὑποκειμένας ταῖς ἐπταπύλοις Θήβαις κόμας<sup>7</sup>. What can be inferred from this distinction, except that Thebes, properly so called, was not now in existence? And it should be remembered that it had been taken and laid waste by the Epigoni, two years before the expedition was set on foot. Yet it does not follow, that because Thebes had been taken and very possibly destroyed by them, the rest of the Bœotians must have been dispossessed of their country. That they must some time indeed before B. C. 1117 have been all ejected, if they returned again B. C. 1117, is certain; but it must have been much more probably after the war of Troy, than before it, if they were able to send 6000 soldiers to that war, B. C. 1190; and if the real cause of this expulsion, and the consequent loss of their own country for a time, as Strabo gives us to understand, was an irruption of barbarians, whom he calls Thracians and Pelasgi.

In Homer's catalogue mention is made of an Ἄρνη, as one of the cities of Bœotia—

Οἱ τε πολυστάφυλον Ἄρνην ἔχον<sup>8</sup>—

where the critics of antiquity appear to have suspected the genuineness of the reading, for which some of them would have substituted *Τάρνην*, and Zenodotus, in particular, Ἄσκηρην<sup>9</sup>. Others conjectured that the Arne of Homer's time had disappeared, having been swallowed up by the lake Copais. It is singular however that they should have raised any question on this point, as they themselves tell us that down to the time of the return of the Bœotians Chæronea itself was called Ἄρνη, and if so, must have been the Arne of the Trojan æra, and of Homer's catalogue<sup>10</sup>. Hesychius

<sup>6</sup> Iliad B. 505.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Eustathius, in loc. 269. 40.

<sup>8</sup> Iliad B. 507.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Schol. in loc. and ad B. 499: and Eustathius, in loc. 270. 25: Steph.

Byz. Ἄρνη: Etym. M. Ἄρνη.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Schol. in Thucyd. i. 12: Pausanias, ix. xl. 3: Tzetzes, ad Lycoph. 644.

that in this same passage, which dates the return of the Bœotians in the 60th year from the capture, he dates the return of the Heraclidæ also in the 80th. Now the return of the Heraclidæ (as we hope to see in the next Dissertation) was connected with an institution, calculated *a priori* to perpetuate its date, and to make it possible to recover it with certainty even in the time of Thucydides; and that was the Carnean festival, and the Carnean ennead or octaëteric cycle, by which the festival was regulated from the first. The date of this cycle appears to have been B. C. 1096; on which supposition, that of the return must have been the year before, B. C. 1097. Let us then be permitted to assume that Thucydides was aware of the true Carnean epoch, and of its connection with the return of the Heraclidæ also. On that principle, his date for the return must have been B. C. 1097, and his date for the capture of Troy, B. C. 1097 + 79, or B. C. 1176. And his date of the capture being thus ascertained, his date for the return of the Bœotians from Arne, in the 60th year after it, must have been B. C. 1176—59, or B. C. 1117\*. And if this was actually the date of the return, it must have been that of the institution of the *Δαφνηφορία* also.

has "Αρνη" πόλις Βοιωτίας as well as Θεσσαλίας; and Hesiod alludes to it in his Scutum, "Αρνη τ' ἦδ' Ἑλίκη<sup>11</sup>. And the tradition, relating to the *Λεοντάρνη* of Bœotia also, in the time of Adrastus, and the expedition of the seven<sup>12</sup>, by implication recognises an "Αρνη without the addition of the *Λέων*, at the same time and in the same country.

On the whole, it does not appear that any reasonable exception can be taken to the truth of the account, quoted *supra* from Proclus<sup>13</sup>. We may observe in the last place that the recovery of Thebes by the Bœotians on this occasion is dated by Diodorus<sup>14</sup> 800 years before its destruction by Alexander, i. e. B. C. 335 + 800, or B. C. 1135, which is only a general statement, yet comes very near to the true date, B. C. 1117.

\* Cf. vol. ii. 533. Æschylus' date, B. C. 1178.

<sup>11</sup> vers. 381. cf. 475.

<sup>12</sup> Eustathius ad Iliad. B. 507. 270.

34: Schol. ad B. 507.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Clinton, F. Hell. i. 67 note E.

and 103 note K.

<sup>14</sup> xix. 53. cf. iv. 67.



SECTION IV.—*On the nature of the Parthenian Ennead; and on its connection with the proper Lunar Cycle of the Primitive Solar year.*

Let us revert then to Proclus' account of the ceremony of the Daphnephoria.

The first observation which we may make upon it is *this*, That though it went by the name of the *Δαφνηφορία*, and branches of laurel were carried by all the rest who took part in it, none was carried by him in particular who had the charge of what is called the *Κωπῶ*; and this bearer of the *Κωπῶ*, though distinguished from the rest by the absence of that badge, was in reality the principal party, and headed the procession; the *δαφνηφόροι*, properly so called, following him, and composing his train. It is a significant circumstance also, that as the first of these *δαφνηφόροι*, (who from his youth, his appearance, his dress, in contradistinction to the rest, may well be supposed intended to represent Apollo himself, to whose honour the whole ceremony was dedicated,) was a *παῖς ἀμφιθαλῆς*, (a boy whose father and mother were both alive,) so the bearer of the *Κωπῶ*, after his father and his mother, was his next of kin. We may infer from these circumstances, that the *Κωπῶ* was the most characteristic part of the ceremony; that the essence of the celebrity consisted in carrying this, at the proper time, dressed up in the manner prescribed by the ritual, and depositing it in the temple of the Ismenian Apollo. Consequently that, in all probability, as first instituted the ceremony consisted simply in this carrying of the *Κωπῶ*, with the accompaniments specified in the description of Proclus; though, as wreaths of laurel were of this number from the first, the name of the *δαφνηφορία* might not have been inapplicable to it even from the first.

Again, with respect to the *Κωπῶ* itself—it is described as a baton or stick, a wand of olive-wood; and nothing more. The name which appears to have been given it is evidently only the idiomatic modification of *κωπή*, analogous to that of many other words in Greek, which we collected on a former occasion <sup>c</sup>; and *κώπη* in Greek was simply the *handle* of

<sup>c</sup> Vol. v. 452 n.

anything, the part of it by which it was grasped and held fast, another word for which was λαβή. It is most frequently used for the handle of the oar, in contradistinction to the flat part, called πλάτη: Κώπης τὸ ἄνω, κώπαιον, τὸ δὲ κάτω πλάτη<sup>d</sup>. It does not appear however, that as concerns the explanation of the ceremony anything depended on the strict meaning of the name given to this one of its badges; though the name itself is singular, and in this form of κωπῶ, so far as we know, occurs in Greek of nothing else.

Again this stick, called the Κωπῶ, was fitted up in a particular manner; i. e. besides the wreaths of laurel and the flowers with which it was decorated, (which do not appear to have been intended for any purpose but that of ornament,) it carried certain appendages of an emblematical kind: i. a brazen ball, or sphere, (a globe,) of comparatively large dimensions, fastened about the top: ii. certain smaller balls, the number of which is not specified, attached to this larger one, and hanging from it: iii. a second ball or sphere, greater than these, but less than the one at the top, fastened about the middle: iv. a certain number of chaplets (στρέμματα) or fillets, attached to this sphere also, and hanging down from this, as the smaller spheres did from the large one at the top—365 in number; the colour of which was purple.

Now it is clearly to be inferred from this description of the fitting up in question, i. that neither the greater nor the lesser of these spheres hung loose from the Κωπῶ, but that both encompassed it—the Κωπῶ passed through both—the larger sphere was fastened about it at the top, and the lesser one, about the middle: from which it follows that the lesser was directly under the greater, and both were in the same right line.

ii. It would not have been difficult to divine the meaning of such emblems as these, even had it not been handed down traditionally, as it appears to have been; for Proclus himself proceeded to explain that the uppermost of the two spheres was understood to denote the sun, and the lower the moon; and the intermediate ones, (those which hung from that at the top,) the stars or the constellations (most probably, the five planets, known to the ancients); and the fillets, which

<sup>d</sup> Hesychius.

were suspended from the lower sphere, were intended of "The round of the year," Τὸν ἐνιαύσιον δρόμον—as, in fact, was intimated by their number, 365, itself.

iii. Such then being the outward configuration of the Κωπὼ, and such the construction commonly put on its component parts; there is no reason to suppose that one of these was not as old as the other: and the whole of this configuration being regarded as symbolical, the most significant of its emblems, and that which leads most directly to the discovery of its meaning, is the particular mode of representing the year, adopted by it. Proclus seems to have thought this the simplest and most obvious of all its symbols; and that the number of these fillets was competent to explain their meaning at once. This number was indeed 365; and the number of the days of the year, it may be said, is 365. But of what year? The lunar year of the Greeks, (the only form of the civil year known to be used by them, from the time of Solon downwards,) did not consist nominally of more than 360 days, nor really of more than 354 or 355, except in intercalary years, when it consisted of many more than 365. And as to the Julian year; if Proclus, the author of the above description, was not Proclus surnamed Diadochus, who flourished in the fifth century<sup>e</sup>, but Euty chius Proclus of Sicca in Africa, the preceptor of Marcus Aurelius<sup>f</sup>, it is morally certain that, among the Greeks in general, no such year in his time was yet in existence, though it might have been in particular instances; as for example at Athens<sup>g</sup>. And yet even the Julian year could not with propriety have been represented as a year of 365 days. Its true description must have been that of one of 365 days and a quarter; or of 365 days every three years, and 366 every fourth.

iv. The truth is, if we go back to the traditionary date of this institution, (that of the return of the Bæotians to their own country from Arne in Thessaly,) we shall not be long at a loss to divine the peculiar kind of year, to which a symbolical representation of the year, at such a time as that, must have been intended to apply: viz. the primitive year, the equable solar year of 365 days—the only form of the

<sup>e</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 465 *n.*

<sup>f</sup> *Hist. Aug. SS. supra*, 347 *n.*

<sup>g</sup> Vol. ii. page 133 sqq.

civil year, in use at this time, not only among the Greeks but among the rest of mankind. The principle of the Julian year indeed had been discovered in theory and applied in practice before this time, even among the Greeks, but only for particular purposes. No form of the year, whether Julian or lunar, had yet superseded the equable, even among the Greeks, for civil purposes; nor did so before the time of Solon. In our opinion therefore, though nothing had been known from any other quarter of the actual date of this institution, we should have been authorised to infer from this part of its emblems, and from the traditionary explanation of these 365 fillets, as symbolical of the year, that it must have gone back to the æra of the Equable Cyclical Calendar.

v. If this was the case, and these 365 chaplets denoted the number of days in the primitive civil year; then it must appear at first sight remarkable that, in the dressing up of the  $\text{Κωπῶ}$ , they should be found attached not to the upper sphere, which denoted the sun, but to the lower, denoting the moon. The primitive civil year was the equable solar year. For the symbols of such a year to have been attached to the sun, and made to depend on the sun, would have appeared only in character with their meaning and reference; but to see them grouped about the moon, hanging from and dependent upon the moon, at first sight seems unnatural and inconsistent. And yet there was doubtless a reason for this arrangement.

Now one such reason might be, that certain other symbols were also admitted into the representation, besides these of the year, which the necessity of the case required to be associated with the sun; viz. the smaller spheres, which were suspended from the large one at the top, and were understood to be intended of the stars in general, or of the planets in particular. As part of the same system of which the sun and the moon were the most conspicuous objects, and yet as revolving about the sun, a true astronomy (and the astronomy of this period, for any thing which is known to the contrary, might have been the true) would require the planets in particular to be grouped about the sun; and the uppermost part of the  $\text{Κωπῶ}$  being thus preoccupied by those symbols of the planets, in their proper relation to the sun,

these 365 emblems of the year must have a place found for them somewhere else. And the place, which appears to have been actually assigned them, being at the bottom of the  $\text{Κωπὼ}$ , and immediately under the lesser sphere which denoted the moon; the question is, In what manner, or in what sense, could such a position, implying apparently if not a closer, yet at least an equal, relation to the moon, be proper for the symbols of the equable solar year?

In answer to this question we observe, that the primitive solar year had its proper lunar year also, associated with it by nature and the constitution of things; and the relation of these two kinds of years, one to the other, was such that the same cycle must serve for both—primitive solar and primitive lunar time, having once set out in a certain relation to each other, must run through the same round, and at the end of it return to the same relation again. This primitive solar and lunar cycle we have hitherto called the primitive Apis cycle, and under that name have frequently explained it<sup>b</sup>. It is manifest however that to a symbolical representation of a lunar and solar cycle, it must be indifferent whether the emblem of such a cycle were attached to the sun or to the moon: and even as attached *de facto* to the moon, it must be understood with an equal relation to the sun. Not to say that in every lunar and solar cycle the ultimate standard of reference, even for the moon, and for lunar time, must be the sun, and solar time. On this principle the proper solar year even of the primitive Apis cycle, in a symbolical representation made up of the emblems of the sun and the moon on the one hand, and of those of the days of the equable solar year on the other, might with almost as much propriety be made to appear to depend on the moon as on the sun. And such being the actual position of these symbols in this representation of the  $\text{Κωπὼ}$ , the natural inference from that fact is, that this configuration was an emblematical mode of representing to the senses the primitive Apis cycle.

vi. And here it is very observable, that the lower sphere denoting the moon, and the upper the sun, as we have al-

<sup>b</sup> Fasti Catholicæ, i. 559 : ii. 489 sqq. : iv. 368 sqq. : Origines Kalendarie Italicæ, Prolegomena, xciii.

ready remarked, from their position, one about the middle of the stick, the other at the top, they must have stood perpendicularly above and below each other. Now that is exactly the position of the moon relatively to the sun at the *conjunction*. The moon, at the conjunction, is directly in a line with the sun—the moon and the sun, as the Greeks expressed it, are ἐπὶ μιᾶς εὐθείας; and the same line would pass through the centres of both. We have no right to suppose that their positions in the Κωπὼ were assigned to these two spheres at random; but if not, we must infer that they were purposely fixed upon in order to typify the relative position of the sun and the moon at the conjunction: and therefore that, as the configuration of the Κωπὼ in general was intended for a symbolical representation of the Apis cycle, or the decursus of solar and lunar time in the equable year in general, so this part of it in particular—the disposition of the symbol of lunar time under that of solar—was intended to intimate the epoch of that cycle, the decursus of both kinds of time in this kind of year in particular; viz. the lunar and solar conjunction, reckoned either from the change or from the phasis. And that is a very important conclusion for the determination of the date of the institution itself, as we must next proceed to shew.

SECTION V.—*On the historical date of the institution of the Κωπὼ; and on its Epoch in the Primitive and the Julian Calendar.*

It appears from the account of Proclus, that while the Bœotians were besieging the Pelasgi in Thebes, a festival came round, common to both the besiegers and the besieged; and this is an argument of a calendar common to both, as the primitive calendar must have been. And it appears further that this common festival was a feast of Apollo; so that Apollo at this time was an object of reverence to both. The date of the introduction of the name and worship of the Hellenic Apollo was 105 years earlier than this siege of Thebes; and nothing could be less improbable *a priori* than this supposition, that Apollo should both have been known to the Greeks of this time, and also have been esteemed and honoured as divine by them, everywhere. Nor is it necessary

to say any thing further in illustration of this point at present, except that the idea and name of the Grecian Apollo were conceived and proposed originally as those of the sun; and Proclus himself tells us here that, among the Bœotians, Apollo and the sun were considered the same.

It appears too that one of the ceremonies, in the observance of this feast of Apollo, consisted in cutting down branches of laurel, and carrying them in procession; so that the laurel in particular was already consecrated to Apollo in the sense of the sun: the origin of which relation, as we hope to see hereafter, is also to be traced to the Pythian institution, 105 years before this time. A *δαφνηφορία* then was one of the recognised ceremonies of this older observance in honour of Apollo; and in that respect there was no difference between the preexisting ceremony of this time, and the Parthenian one of later times. And forasmuch as it was in the evening of this day, so kept and so distinguished, and when the ceremony of the day was over, that Polematas, according to tradition, had the vision enjoining him to institute the *δαφνηφορία δι' ἐνναετηρίδος*—it may reasonably be inferred from this coincidence, that the stated date of this octennial institution, and that of the annual ceremony of the same kind in general, out of which it arose, were intended to be the same. The ceremony which Polematas was now commanded to institute, under the name of the *δαφνηφορία*, but with the addition of the *Κωπῶ*, was not intended or expected to differ from the *δαφνηφορία* of older date, except in being celebrated once in eight years, while that was celebrated every year\*. The proper day therefore of this new ceremony was no doubt from the first intended to be the same with that of the older

\* It is further recorded indeed, that on the third day after this feast, common to both the parties, and after the vision in question, seen in the evening of the feast day, Polematas attacked the Pelasgi, and recovered possession of Thebes; but it is not thereby implied that this success was the moving cause of the new institution; only that, as a sign and seal of the favour of Apollo, who had himself commanded the institution two days before—it was the sign and seal of the proposed institution also. The success of this day, thus gained through the assistance of Apollo, pledged Polematas and his followers so much the more to the performance of their own part, in carrying into effect the proposed institution.

of the same name. The question is only, What was that day, in the case of this older observance?

In answer to this question, it must be replied that there is proof, from the testimony of the *Odyssey* of Homer, that, only ten years later than the capture of Troy, one day in the primitive calendar was already recognised as sacred to Apollo, and observed as a feast day, the 7th of the first month of the primitive civil calendar; the primitive Thoth of the Egyptians, the primitive Gamelion of the Greeks. But there is no proof either in Homer, or anywhere else, that the seventh of any other month in the primitive calendar was recognised and treated as sacred to Apollo at this early period; though in the course of time the consecration of the seventh day of every month to him appears to have grown up out of this of the seventh of the first; as it was *a priori* likely to do. The answer therefore to the question is supplied by this distinction. It is known (and on the testimony of Homer) that the seventh of the primitive Gamelion of the Greeks was recognised and observed as sacred to Apollo, within ten years after the capture of Troy. Nor can it be supposed to have lost that character, and to have ceased to be so treated, within only fifty years later.

If such however was still the case, and the seventh of the primitive Gamelion was still kept as the feast day of Apollo, within sixty years of the capture of Troy; the day of the institution of the Κωπὼ must have been the seventh of the primitive Gamelion, in the year of the cyclical æra current at the time. And that too having been the case, then, from the nature of the emblems associated with the Κωπὼ, and their situation in relation to each other, it must follow that, in the year of the institution, the seventh of the primitive Gamelion was also the date of the lunar conjunction, reckoned either from the change or from the phasis. Let us therefore apply this test to the year of which we have already seen reason, from the testimony of Thucydides, to conclude it must have been that of the institution, B. C. 1117.

This year of the vulgar æra, B. C. 1117, A. M. 2888, corresponded to Æra Cyclica 2890; and in that year of this æra, the first of the primitive Thoth, or Gamelion, reckoned according to the Julian rule, as our Tables shew, bore date



May 26 at midnight; and therefore the seventh, June 1 at midnight. In our General Lunar Calendar, it corresponded to Period x. Cycle viii. 19; in which year the principal new moon (Nisan 1) bore date April 2 at midnight: but the year being the last of the cycle, this date was one day in excess, and ought to be assumed April 1 at midnight: and that being supposed the date of the Nisan of our Tables this year, April 1 at midnight, that of our Sivan, the third new moon of the year, is determined to May 30 at midnight\*, and the third of that moon to June 1 at midnight.

It follows that, if the Κωπῶ was instituted at this time, and attached to the seventh of the primitive Gamelion, it was attached to the *Luna tertia*, dated from the conjunction or change, to the *Luna prima*, dated from the phasis: and this coincidence, it appears to us, is competent to fix the year of the institution. It is self-evident, from the nature of the Apis cycle, that if this coincidence held good Æra Cyc. 2890, B. C. 1117, it could not have held good before, later than Æra Cyc. 2865, B. C. 1142; nor hold good again earlier than Æra Cyc. 2915, B. C. 1092: the former too early, the latter too late, for the date of an event which could not have been either much more or much less than sixty years distant from the capture of Troy. If then we accept this date of the return of the Bœotians in the æra of Troy, on the authority of Thucydides and Strabo, and that of the institution of the Κωπῶ, at the same time as the return, on the authority of the Bœotian tradition respecting the origin of their Parthenia, we have no alternative except that of acquiescing in this year, Æra Cyclica 2890, as the actual year, and in the seventh of the primitive Gamelion, the *Luna prima* reckoned from the phasis, June 1, B. C. 1117, as the actual day, of the institution.

\* That our General Lunar Calendar may safely be trusted for this date, appears from actual calculation.

B. C. 1117.

		h.	m.	s.	
Mean new moon	May 30	4	47	48	m. t. Greenwich.
	May 30	6	21	6	m. t. Thebes.
True new moon	May 29	22	44	27	m. t. Greenwich.
	May 30	0	17	45	m. t. Thebes.

SECTION VI.—*On the Cycle of the Parthenian Ennead in the Apis Cycle.*

It appears from the same account of the origin of the *Κωπὼ*, quoted from Proclus *supra*, that the vision which enjoined the observance of the ceremony prescribed also the cycle, according to which it should be observed—*διὰ ἐννεατηρίδος*. This phrase, *δι' ἐννεατηρίδος*, or *διὰ ἐννέα ἐτῶν*, as we have often explained, is analogous to that of *διὰ τριετηρίδος*, intended of a cycle of two years, or that of *διὰ πενταετηρίδος* or *διὰ πέντε ἐτῶν*, applied to one of four. The cycle then of the *Κωπὼ*, the *Δαφνηφορία*, or the *Παρθένια*, prescribed from the first by the same authority which enjoined the institution, was a cycle of *eight* years, in this idiomatic sense of one of *nine*.

But as this mode of speaking is applicable to a cycle of eight years of any kind, the knowledge of the fact that the cycle prescribed for this observance from the first was an octaëteris of some sort, would not be sufficient to determine the kind of cycle which was actually intended. To come to a right conclusion on that point, we must refer to the particulars of the observance itself, as handed down from the first; especially to the configuration of the *Κωπὼ*, the greater and the lesser sphere, one of them typical of the sun and the other of the moon, and their position relatively to each other, one at the top, the other at the bottom, in the same right line; and the 365 chaplets, typical of the days of the year, underneath them both: the inference from which disposition of the parts of the *Κωπὼ*, in their proper emblematical sense, and in their proper relation to each other, can be nothing but what we have already deduced from it; viz. that this *Κωπὼ* and its component parts were neither more nor less than a symbolical representation of the solar and lunar cycle of the Primitive Equable year. Consequently, if the cycle of the *Κωπὼ* from the first was one of eight years, it must have been a cycle of eight years, reckoned in terms of the primitive solar year.

And with respect to the mode of reckoning such a cycle perpetually; the Apis cycle, in solar years of the Primitive or Equable standard, was a cycle of 25 years; in lunar years

of 354 or 355 days in length, (the proper length of the lunar year in conjunction with the equable solar perpetually), it was a cycle of 26 years—with this difference only—viz. that the 26th year was a year of 266 days instead of 354, nine lunar months instead of twelve, like all before it. It was consequently in itself, and in comparison of the rest of the years of its proper cycle, an incomplete year, which nevertheless, for a purely cyclical purpose, and as making one of a cycle, must be treated and reckoned in as a complete one.

It follows that in one such period of 26 lunar years there would be three cycles of eight years complete, and two more of a fourth; the seats of which would be the 1st, the 9th, the 17th, and the 25th of the series respectively; and in two such periods there would be six cycles of eight years, and four more of a seventh; in three there would be nine cycles, and six years of a tenth; and in four there would be thirteen cycles of eight years without any remainder, i. e. thirteen complete. It follows that the period of the ἀποκατάστασις of the cycle of eight years, in the Apis cycle of 26 lunar years perpetually, must have been one of *thirteen* octaëteric cycles. If the reckoning of this cycle of eight years set out in the first year of the Apis cycle, and on a given day in that year, and went on regularly from cycle to cycle, at the end of four such Apis cycles, and thirteen octaëteric cycles, it would return to the same year and the same day of the Apis cycle as at first. And in these four Apis cycles there would be neither more nor less than 100 equable solar years, and in the thirteen octaëteric periods commensurate with them neither more nor less than 104 lunar years of the proper standard of the Apis cycle perpetually. We may therefore draw out the succession of octaëterides of this kind in terms of the Apis cycle for any length of time we please. Assuming, for example, that the solar epoch of the first such Apis period was Thoth 7 at midnight, Æra Cyclica 2890, and the lunar epoch the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>, we may exhibit the decursus of the octaëteric cycle through each of these kinds of years, for four Apis periods, as follows.

*Scheme of the succession of the cycle of eight years (the Parthenian Ennead) in the Apis cycle, through the first Period of 100 equable solar, 104 equable lunar years, from Thoth 7, the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>, Æra cyc. 2890, to Thoth 7, the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>, Æra cyc. 2990.*

Cf. the *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 494 : iv. 383.

APIS CYCLE.			PARTHENIAN ENNEADS.				
Solar.	Lunar.	Epoch, Luna 3 <sup>a</sup> , Æra cyc. 2890.	Period i.	Period ii.	Period iii.	Period iv.	Period v.
i	i	Thoth 7	Cycle i				Cycle xiv
i	ii	Epagomene 1					
ii	*iii	Mesore 20				Cycle xi	
iii	iv	— 10					
iv	v	Epiphi 29			Cycle viii		
v	*vi	— 18					
vi	vii	— 8		Cycle v			
vii	viii	Patini 27					
viii	*ix	— 16	Cycle ii				Cycle xv
ix	x	— 6					
x	xi	Pachon 25				Cycle xii	
xi	*xii	— 14					
xii	xiii	— 4			Cycle ix		
xiii	xiv	Pharmuthi 23					
xiv	*xv	— 12		Cycle vi			
xv	xvi	— 2					
xvi	xvii	Phamenoth 21	Cycle iii				Cycle xvi
xvii	*xviii	— 10					
xviii	xix	Mecheir 30				Cycle xiii	
xix	xx	— 19					
xx	*xxi	— 8			Cycle x		
xxi	*xxii	Tybi 28					
xxii	xxiii	— 18		Cycle vii			
xxiii	xxiv	— 7					
xxiv	*xxv	Chœac 26	Cycle iv				Cycle xvii
xxv	xxvi	— 16					

SECTION VII.—*On the relation of the Parthenian Ennead to the Bœotian Correction, B. C. 567; and on the date of the Κωπὼ in that.*

The above scheme of the decursus of the period of eight years in the cycle of 26 lunar, 25 solar, years of the primitive standard, so digested for one term of 104 years of the former, 100 of the latter, is competent to serve for any number of such periods of both kinds which may be required. All that it is necessary to observe with respect to the decursus of one of these cycles in the other perpetually is that, though the solar date of the epoch will continue the same from one Period of 25 years to another, the lunar one, by virtue of that law of the relation of equable time to Julian, through the different Periods of our Fasti, which we have often had occasion to explain<sup>i</sup>, will not remain the same, but will rise one term from Period to Period successively. The nature of this law is that, if a given equable date is to continue the same in terms perpetually, the Julian, which corresponded to it at first, in order to correspond to it ever after, must rise one number higher in the Julian notation of days and nights, with successive changes of the Julian Type of our Fasti. And as a given lunar date is to all intents and purposes a given Julian one; it follows that if the solar epoch of these equable Periods was Thoth 7 at first, and continued to be Thoth 7 ever after, and the corresponding lunar epoch at first was the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>, in order to agree to the solar epoch continually, it must rise, with successive Periods of our Fasti, first to the Luna 4<sup>a</sup>, then to the Luna 5<sup>a</sup>, and so on—for a certain time at least, if not perpetually.

<sup>i</sup> Fasti Catholici, ii. 525 : iv. 378.  
Orig. Kalend. Italicæ, Prolegomena,  
xlix : Vol. ii. 511 sqq. Supra, Vol. i.

page 242 sqq. Dissertation ii. ch. iii.  
sect. v.

*Scheme of the succession of the Parthenian Ennead in the Equable Apis Period of 100 solar, 104 lunar, years, and in the Julian Periods of the Fasti Catholici, from Æra cyc. 2890, B. C. 1117 to Æra cyc. 3390, B. C. 567.*

Period of the Fasti.	B. C.	Per. of 100 eq. years.	Æra cyc.	Parthenian Ennead.	Epoch.	
xxiv. 4	1117	i	2890	i	Thoth 7	Luna 3 <sup>a</sup>
	1017	ii	2990	xiv	— 7	— 3 <sup>a</sup>
	917	iii	3090	xxvii	— 7	— 4 <sup>a</sup>
	817	iv	3190	xl	— 7	— 5 <sup>a</sup>
	717	v	3290	liii	— 7	— 6 <sup>a</sup>
xxviii. 56	617	vi	3390	lxvi	— 7	— 7 <sup>a</sup>

This Ennead took its rise in the *fourth* year of our xxvith Julian Period, B. C. 1117; and we have brought it down in this scheme in periods of 100 equable years to the fifty-sixth of our xxviiiith, B. C. 617: at the ingress of which, the solar epoch remaining the same as at first, Thoth 7, the lunar, by virtue of the law in question, should be found to have risen from the Luna 3<sup>a</sup> to the Luna 7<sup>a</sup>: and it is easy to shew that this was actually the case.

Thoth 1 at midnight, Æra cyc. 3390, according to our Tables, corresponded to Jan. 26 at midnight, B. C. 617; and consequently Thoth 7 at midnight to Feb. 1 at midnight: and this being assumed as the date of the Luna 7<sup>a</sup> that year, January 26 must have been that of the Luna 1<sup>a</sup>. But it is here to be observed that, between Æra cyc. 2890, B. C. 1117, the assumed epoch of this entire succession, and Æra cyc. 3390, B. C. 617, that of the sixth of these Periods of 100 equable years, there was an interval of 500 equable years; in the course of which the Apis cycle itself was liable to generate an excess of calendar lunar time over mean or true, amounting to *one day*<sup>k</sup>: so that the true luna septima of this epoch, B. C. 617, instead of corresponding to Thoth 7, Æra cyc. 3390, did in reality correspond to Thoth 6, and the Luna 8<sup>a</sup> to Thoth 7. On this principle Thoth 1, Æra cyc. 3390, Jan. 26, B. C. 617, instead of being the Luna Prima, was more properly the Luna Secunda; and the last of the Epagomenæ, Æra cyc. 3389, Jan. 25 was the Luna Prima.

<sup>k</sup> See our Fasti Catholici, iv. 379 sqq. : cf. i. 66. 97.

And that this was sufficiently near to the truth appears from our General Lunar Tables, Period xii. iii. 5, when the first of Sebat, our eleventh month, bore date Jan. 24 at midnight, and the first of Adar, Feb. 23, at midnight; on which day there was an eclipse of the sun, at 5 P. M. for the meridian of Paris.

Now this year, B. C. 617, Æra cyc. 3390, was only fifty years earlier than the date of the Bœotian correction, B. C. 567, Æra cyc. 3440: and the above scheme being continued from the lxvith Ennead, Thoth 7, the Luna 8<sup>a</sup>, Æra cyc. 3390, B. C. 617, for 53 solar, 56 lunar, years, we get the epoch of the lxxiird, Æra cyc. 3443, B. C. 564, in the *fourth* solar, the *fifth* lunar, year of the third Apis cycle; the stated solar epoch of which would be Epiphi 29<sup>1</sup>, the lunar the same as at first, the Luna 8<sup>a</sup>.

Æra Cyclica 3443, B. C. 564.

<u>Midnight.</u>		<u>Midnight.</u>		<u>Midnight.</u>		<u>Midnight.</u>	
Thoth	1	Jan.	12	Mecheir	1	June	11
Phaophi	1	Feb.	11	Phamenoth	1	July	11
Athyr	1	March	13	Pharmuthi	1	Aug.	10
Chœac	1	April	12	Pachon	1	Sept.	9
Tybi	1	May	12	Paüni	1	Oct.	9

Epiphi 1 November 8  
 — 29 December 6 the Luna 8<sup>a</sup>

The Octaëteric correction having been substituted among the Bœotians for the primitive equable calendar only three years before this time; it is to be presumed that the ceremony of the Κωπὼ, hitherto regulated by the Parthenian Ennead in terms of the Apis cycle, would now be transferred to the Octaëteric calendar, and begin to be regulated by the cycle of that calendar. The only question will be, as to its proper date in this cycle.

Now the regular date in the old Ennead, just at this point of time, the ingress of the lxxiird cycle of that Ennead, according to the above scheme, being Epiphi 29, Æra cyc. 3443, Dec. 6, B. C. 564, and B. C. 564, in the first Period of the Bœotian Octaëteris, corresponding to Cycle i. 4, we have only to turn to the Type of this Correction<sup>m</sup> to see that in

<sup>1</sup> See supra, page 364.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. iii. Append. Table ii.

that year of the cycle the stated date of the xiith month was Nov. 29, and therefore the stated date of the 8th of that month was Dec. 6. If then the observance of the Κωπὼ was transferred at this time from the Parthenian Ennead to that of the Octaëteric correction, its stated date, as celebrated only once in every cycle of the octaëteris of the calendar, would be the eighth of the twelfth month in the fourth year of the cycle, the eighth of the month, the name of which in the Bœotian lunar calendar we have seen reason to conclude was Alalcomenius<sup>u</sup>. The coincidence which held good at this moment was something remarkable; viz. that the stated lunar date of the Κωπὼ in its original cycle was the Luna 8<sup>a</sup>, and as now transferred to this new cycle was the Luna 8<sup>a</sup> also: and yet it was only a necessary consequence of the relation of the Bœotian Lunar calendar for the time being to the moon.

SECTION VIII.—*Confirmation of the preceding conclusions by some other considerations.*

i. Relation of the Parthenian Ennead to the Primitive Apis Cycle.

The preceding account of this Ennead, and in particular of the kind of years in which it was intended to be reckoned from the first, (and no doubt was so, down to the date of the Bœotian correction,) is well calculated to confirm an opinion which we have often had occasion to express, that the natural lunar cycle of the primitive solar year must have come down along with it from the first. That this was the fact among the Egyptians happens to be known on better and clearer, because more direct, proofs than in any other instance<sup>o</sup>: but there is no reason to suppose that the same thing did not hold good of the rest of mankind, at first at least. And in reality the fact, which we established before p, of the relation of the Octaëteric correction of Minos to the primitive Apis cycle, and that which we hope to establish hereafter of the relation of the Octaëteric correction of Philammon of Delphi

<sup>u</sup> Vol. ii. 290. 307. 316.

<sup>o</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 368 sqq., and our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*, Prolegomena, xciii sqq.

<sup>p</sup> Vol. v. 539.



to this cycle also, and this, which we have just been endeavouring to establish, of the relation of the Parthenian Ennead to the equable solar and the equable lunar year in conjunction, must do much to authorise the same conclusion, that the natural lunar cycle of the primitive solar year was known to the ancient Greeks, as well as to the ancient Egyptians.

We exhibited the scheme of the succession of this primitive Apis cycle from *Æra Cyclica* 1, to *Æra Cyclica* 3026, digested in a series of periods of 125 equable years, accommodated to the Julian periods of our *Fasti Catholici* also, in the first Part of this present work <sup>q</sup>; and it may be worth while to compare the equable solar and lunar epoch of the Parthenian ennead, as instituted *de facto* *Æra Cyc.* 2890, and attached *de facto* to Thoth 7, the lunar 3rd, with that of the corresponding year of the primitive Apis cycle. For this purpose we must proceed as follows.

Epoch of the Parthenian Ennead, <i>Æra Cyc.</i>	..	2890
Epoch of the xxvith Type of the Primitive Apis Cycle		2751
		139

Epoch of the Parthenian Ennead in the Primitive Apis Cycle, Type xxvi. Cycle vi. 15 = 14.

At the ingress of this type, the solar epoch, Thoth 8, was falling on the lunar 30th; but before the end of it, (i. e. in *Æra Cyc.* 2887, B. C. 1120,) for the reason explained in our former work <sup>r</sup>, it had already risen to the Luna 1<sup>a</sup>.

Now in the 15th year of the lunar, the 14th of the solar, cycle of each of these types, the solar epoch was Pharmuthi 13; the lunar at this period of their decursus, for the reason just mentioned, was the Luna 1<sup>a</sup>. We have therefore,

*Primitive Apis Cycle, Type xxvi. vi. 15 = 14.*

Pharmuthi 13, Luna 1<sup>a</sup>, *Æra Cyc.* 2889—2890.

Month.	Month.		
i Pharmuthi 13	iv Epiphi 12	<i>Æra Cyc.</i> 2889	
ii Pachon 13	v Mesore 11	—	—
iii Paüni 12	vi Thoth 6	—	2890
	Thoth 6	Luna 1	
	— 7	— 2	

<sup>q</sup> *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 383.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* page 378. cf. *supra*, 365.

The date then of the Parthenian *Ennead*, strictly deduced from the primitive *Apis* cycle of the time being, must have been Thoth 7, the Luna 2<sup>a</sup>. And if that should appear to be inconsistent with the conclusion to which we have already come, that its date *de facto* was Thoth 7, the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>, it is to be considered that the primitive *Apis* cycle, at this period of its decursus, had accumulated an excess of nearly a day, which we correct in our General Scheme at the ingress of Type xxviii, *Æra Cyc.* 3001: so that the true lunar character of Thoth 7, even *Æra Cyc.* 2890, was more properly the Luna 3<sup>a</sup> than the Luna 2<sup>a</sup>.\*

- ii. Decorations of the *Κωπὼ*; and the *Apollo Χαλάζιος*,  
to whom it was dedicated.

The decorations of the *Κωπὼ*, as distinct from the spheres and the fillets or tassels, according to Proclus, consisted partly of wreaths of laurel, partly of flowers. With respect to the former; the laurel being an evergreen, and most flourishing and luxuriant at the end of the autumnal, and the beginning of the winter quarter, it could never be wanting for the climate of Bœotia, and in the neighbourhood of mount Helicon, at such a time in the natural year as the 6th of December, the stated date of the *Κωπὼ* in the Octaëteric cycle of the Bœotian calendar.

With regard to the flowers; it does not appear whether these made part of the decorations of the *Κωπὼ* from the first, or only from the time of its adoption into the Octaëteric calendar, B. C. 564: nor whether these flowers, as used on these occasions, were the productions of nature, or raised by artificial means. The *Adonia* of the Greeks were celebrated in the middle of the summer; and yet the first shoots of

\* Or it may be assumed that the rise of the lunar epoch, in these successive types, beginning with the Luna 4<sup>a</sup>, was not allowed to go beyond the Luna 29<sup>a</sup>; and that which is marked in our scheme, at the ingress of Type xxvi, for the Luna 30, should more properly be the Luna 1<sup>a</sup>. This correction would bring out the epoch, in the xxixth Type, (that in which the *Apis* cycle of history took its rise,) the Luna 4<sup>a</sup>, exactly in accordance with the original one in Type i, the Luna 4<sup>a</sup> also.

On this principle, Type xxvi. vi. 14 = 15, the epoch will be Pharmuthi 13, *Æra Cyc.* 2889, the Luna 2<sup>a</sup>, and from that we shall obtain Thoth 7, *Æra Cyc.* 2890, the Luna 3<sup>a</sup>.

vegetable life were wanted on these occasions, and were raised for the purpose, in what were called the gardens of Adonis. It was just as possible, if flowers were wanted for such a ceremony as this of the Κωπὼ, at the opposite season of the year, that they too might be raised by artificial means. It is equally possible that, for such a climate as that of Bœotia, flowers, the production of nature, which even in our own climate may often be found growing wild in the month of December, might be found in abundance at the stated time of the Κωπὼ. In any case, there is no more difficulty in providing flowers for it in the month of December, from the time of its adoption into the Octaëteric calendar, and its confinement thereby to the beginning of winter, than in the month of June, at its first institution—not far from the point of midsummer—long after the season of flowers, properly so called, in Greece was past<sup>s</sup>.

It is however an observable circumstance, that in Proclus' time, the Κωπὼ dressed up and decorated, as he describes it, after being carried in procession in public, was disposed of at last in the temple of Apollo, surnamed Ἴσμηνίος, and also Χαλάζιος. With regard to the first of these titles, Ἴσμηνός was the name of a river by Thebes, near which Apollo had a temple—Ἴσμηνός ποταμός Θηβῶν, ὅθεν καὶ Ἴσμηνίος ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ τιμᾶται<sup>t</sup>—

Δίρκης τε πηγαῖς οὐδ' ἀπ' Ἴσμηνοῦ λέγω<sup>v</sup>—

Πρὸς τε Παλλάδος διπλοῖς  
ναοῖς ἐπ' Ἴσμηνοῦ τε μαντεία σποδῶ<sup>x</sup>—

Καὶ γὰρ ἔστι παρὰ τῷ Ἴσμηνῷ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν<sup>v</sup>—

Οἱ δ' ᾧστ' ἠΐθεοι Φοῖβω χορὸν ἢ ἐνὶ Πυθοῖ,  
ἢ που ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ, ἢ ἐφ' ὕδασι<sup>v</sup> Ἴσμηνοῖο  
στησάμενοι<sup>z</sup>—

Ἴσμηνός ποταμός Βοιωτίας, ἀφ' οὗ Ἴσμηνίου Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόν<sup>a</sup>—

Φεῦγε καὶ Ἀονίη τὸν ἕνα δρόμον· αἱ δ' ἐφέποντο  
Δίρκη τε Στροφίη τε μελαμψηφίδος ἔχουσαι  
Ἴσμηνοῦ χέρα πατρός<sup>b</sup>—

<sup>s</sup> See vol. i. 105 sqq. 96 sqq.

<sup>t</sup> Scholia in Phœnissas, 101. Ἴσμηνοῦ.

<sup>v</sup> Æschylus, Septem Contra Thebas,  
273. cf. the Scholia.

<sup>x</sup> Ædipus Tyr. 20.

<sup>y</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>z</sup> Apollon. Rhod. i. 536.

<sup>a</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Callimachus, Hymnus in Delum,  
75. cf. the Schol.

Σὺν ἀθανάτοις δὲ χορεύων  
 εἰς γάμον Ἀρμονίης Ἴσμηνίου ἦλθεν Ἀπόλλων <sup>c</sup>—

"Ἔστι δὲ λόφος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῶν πυλῶν ἱερὸς Ἀπόλλωνος. καλεῖται δὲ ὁ τε λόφος καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἴσμηνίου, παραρρέοντος τοῦ ποταμοῦ ταύτη τοῦ Ἴσμηνίου <sup>d</sup>—So called from Ismenius, a son of Apollo and Melia <sup>e</sup>: Τοῦ δὲ Ἴσμηνίου τὸ ὄνομα ἔσχεν ὁ ποταμός. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰ πρότερα ἦν ἀνώνυμος, εἰ δὴ καὶ Λάδων ἐκαλεῖτο πρὶν Ἴσμηνιον γενέσθαι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνος.

With respect to the second, the old reading of the text in this instance was *Γαλαξίας*; the derivation of which from *Γαλαξία*, the milky-way in Greek, would be obvious. But then the derivation of the title from such an etymon as that would itself have been the strongest ground of disbelief, that such a title could ever have been applied to Apollo, as the same at least with the sun; for that would have confounded *Γαλαξίας* with *Λοξίας*, and the ecliptic or *λοξὴ ὁδὸς*, with the Galaxy, or milky-way. *Γαλαξία* too, according to the Greek grammarians, was the name of a species of pudding at Athens, made of barley-flour and milk <sup>f</sup>. But it is superfluous to object to the application of such a title to Apollo here, since the last and most critical editions of the text of Photius, in this instance, read *Χαλάξιος*, not *Γαλαξίας*. What then could be the meaning of this epithet of *Χαλάξιος*, but that of *Grandineus*, or *Grandinosus*? the Apollo of *Hail*, or *Hail-storms*? And what propriety could there have been in laying up the *Κωπῶ*, at the end of the ceremony, in the temple of Apollo, the Hailer, if the stated time of the ceremony did not coincide with that season of the natural year, when hail-storms, even for the climate of Bœotia, might be no extraordinary phenomenon—that is, the end of November, and the beginning of December?

### iii. The *Παρθένια*, or *Παρθένεια*.

The songs, which formed another of the accompaniments of the *Κωπῶ*, being chanted by choruses of young women, or virgins, appear to have taken their name from that circumstance, and to have been called *Παρθένια*, or *Παρθένεια*, (τὰ

<sup>c</sup> Nonnus, v. 100.

<sup>d</sup> Pausanias, ix. x. 2.  
<sup>f</sup> Anecdota, 229. 25.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 5.

τῶν παρθένων μέλη,) accordingly. The ancients have recorded that many of the lost poems of Pindar were of this description: "Ἐγραψε δ' ἐν βιβλίοις ἑξ' Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ τὰτα· Ὀλυμπιονίκας, Πυθιονίκας, Νεμεονίκας, Ἴσθμιονίκας, Προσόδια, Παρθένια κ', τ. λ. §—Ὅκ ἡγνῶει δὲ (sc. Plato,) ὅτι πολλὰ Δῶρια Παρθένεια ἄλλα Ἀλκμᾶνι\* καὶ Πυδάρῳ καὶ Σιμωνίδῃ καὶ Βακχυλίδῃ πεποιήται<sup>h</sup>—Πίνδαρος...ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Παρθενίων<sup>i</sup>—

Καὶ Παρθένεια καὶ κατὰ τὰ Σιμωνίδου<sup>k</sup>—

But they tell us also that these compositions of Pindar, so entitled in general, were of two kinds, the Παρθένια, or Παρθένεια ἀπλῶς, and the Παρθένεια κεχωρισμένα. Φέρεται δὲ καὶ Παρθενίων β', καὶ γ', ὁ ἐπιγράφει κεχωρισμένων Παρθενίων<sup>l</sup>: i. e. there was a third book of these particular songs, which Pindar himself had distinguished from the rest by publishing it separately, and giving it the title of Κεχωρισμένα. Πίνδαρος φησιν ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν Παρθένων (corr. Παρθενίων, or Παρθενείων) ὅτι τῶν ἔραστῶν οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες εὐχονται τὸν ἥλιον (τῷ ἡλίῳ) αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες (τῆν) σελήνην<sup>m</sup>: and they are quoted under this title by the Scholia on Pindar<sup>n</sup>. The reason of this distinction has not been explained; and yet it would be accounted for, by supposing this book of separate or select Parthenia to have consisted of such songs and hymns as were intended for these occasions of the Κοπῶ, and the anniversaries of the Parthenian Ennead. Such occasions were of rare occurrence; and even in the life-time of Pindar could not have happened more than eight or nine times: and in proportion to their infrequency would be their solemnity, and the interest attaching to them. It is therefore far from improbable, that these select Parthenia were written by Pindar for this oldest and most characteristic of the customs of his country; and as such were separated from the rest, and published in a volume by themselves.

\* Steph. Byz. in Ἐρυσίχῃ, quotes four lines of the beginning of the second book of these Παρθένεια ἄσματα of Aleman.

§ Vita, pag. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Plutarch, De Musica, xvii.

<sup>i</sup> Schol. ad Arist. Acharn. 720. ἀγο-  
ράζειν.

<sup>k</sup> Aves, 919. cf. ad 1099.

<sup>l</sup> Boeckh. p. 9, 10. Ex Vratisl. A.  
p. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. in Theocrit. ad Idyll. ii. 10.  
Σελάνα.

<sup>n</sup> Ad Pyth. iii. 139. σὸν Πανί.

iv. The *Δαφνηφορία* older at Thebes than the  
Parthenian *Ennead*.

Τὸ δὲ γε καὶ ἐς ἔμὲ ἔτι γινόμενον οἶδα ἐν Θήβαις τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Ἰσμηρίῳ· παῖδα οἴκου τε δοκίμου, καὶ αὐτὸν εὖ μὲν εἶδους εὖ δ' ἔχοντα καὶ ῥώμης, ἱερέα ἐνιαύσιον ποιούσιν· ἐπικλησις δὲ ἐστὶν οἱ δαφνηφόρος· στεφάνους γὰρ φύλλων δάφνης φοροῦσιν οἱ παῖδες. εἰ μὲν οὖν πᾶσιν ὁμοίως καθέστηκεν ἀναθεῖναι δαφνηφορήσαντας χαλκοῦν τῷ θεῷ τρίποδα, οὐκ ἔχω δηλῶσαι· δοκῶ δὲ οὐ πᾶσιν εἶναι νόμον· οὐ γὰρ δὴ πολλοὺς ἐώρων αὐτόθι ἀνακειμένους· οἱ δ' οὖν εὐδαιμονέστεροι τῶν παίδων ἀνατιθέασιν. ἐπιφανὴς δὲ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τε ἀρχαιότητι καὶ τοῦ ἀναθέντος τῇ δόξῃ τρίπους ἐστὶν, Ἀμφιτρώωνος ἀνάθημα, ἐπὶ Ἡρακλεῖ δαφνηφορήσαντι °.

At first sight this description would appear to refer to the same ceremony as that of the *Chrestomathia*, of which we have hitherto been giving an account; but a little consideration will soon convince us that such a conclusion would be premature. For, i. this ceremony of Pausanias was an annual one of its kind, that of Proclus an octennial. ii. The principal person in this was a youth, in the other a grown-up man. iii. The laurel branch, and nothing else, was the proper characteristic badge of this ceremony, the *Κωπῶ* was that of the other. iv. This was much older than the other; *this* having gone back, according to tradition, as far as the time of Amphitryon, the father of Hercules, at least—while *that* did not go further back than the return of the *Bœotians* from Arne, nearly 200 years later.

The principal use of this older ceremony at Thebes is to explain that part of the later one which gave it the name of the *Δαφνηφορία*. The carrying of branches of laurel was one of the characteristics of the *Κωπῶ*—but, as it now appears, merely because the *Κωπῶ* itself was this more ancient ceremony, with the badges and insignia, peculiar to itself, grafted upon it. We may presume therefore that the date of this older *δαφνηφορία* was the same with that of the *Κωπῶ*; viz. the seventh of the primitive Thoth. And this being the day sacred to Apollo among the Greeks, from the time of the institution of the *Pythean Ennead* at least; we may infer

° Pausanias, ix. x. 4.

from this account of the more ancient *δαφνηφορία*, that the usual mode of celebrating that day, and in this relation to Apollo, probably was by a procession of worshippers carrying branches of laurel, the leader of which, in age, and appearance, and beauty, was intended to represent Apollo himself, and as being the first in a procession, in which all carried boughs of laurel, was called *ὁ δαφνηφόρος κατ' ἐξοχήν*—and in the case too of those, whose circumstances could afford it, by the dedication of a tripod of brass to Apollo himself, in the name of this priest and leader\*.

SECTION IX. — *On the probable motive to the institution of the Parthenian Ennead; and on the Fable of Tityus.*

According to the traditional account of the institution of the *Κοπῶν*, it was due to a vision of Apollo, and an express command of his to the leader of the Bœotians, at the time of their return; and it is very conceivable that this might be the account given out at the time,—and that Polematas, with whom the idea of the institution must have originated, in order to have the authority of a Divine sanction for what he was about to do, might attribute it to a revelation of the will of Apollo, attested and confirmed so soon after, by the success of the Bœotians in the capture of Thebes, and their resettlement in their own country.

The connection of the institution with this return, and its historical use as a perpetual memorial of an event so interesting to the Bœotian community, would be the same, whatso-

\* With respect to the particular tradition which attributed one of these tripods to Amphitryon in the name of Hercules his son; its genuineness may well be doubted; since if Hercules was born about B. C. 1260, his boyhood or youth must have anticipated by many years the first introduction of the name and worship of the Pythian Apollo. A tripod however might have been dedicated by Amphitryon in his name, as an offering to the sun, which might easily in after-times be confounded with one to Apollo. Herodotus, v. 57, describes a tripod in the temple of Apollo Ismenius, which tradition attributed to Amphitryon too. This however was not that which Pausanias alluded to; having been dedicated in his own name, and for a victory over the Telebœæ. It was probably dedicated to the sun; and afterwards set up in the temple of the Ismenian Apollo, as another name for the sun. Apollo, as such, was not yet known of, in the time of Amphitryon.

ever the motive to it in any other respect. But as to its immediate cause, and the ultimate end and purpose which it might be designed to answer; in our opinion, the most probable explanation is to be found in the fact, That there existed at this very time an octaëteric cycle, dedicated to Apollo or the sun, and attached to the seventh of the month, as the day sacred to Apollo or the sun, but not reckoned in primitive equable years, nor attached to the seventh of the first month of the Primitive Calendar, as this of Polematas was. This older and preexisting cycle was that of Philammon of Delphi, instituted B. C. 1222, and attached to August 26, the 7th of the primitive Athyr, in that year; of which we hope, in a future Dissertation, to give a particular account.

This cycle was reckoned in Julian years, and yet professed to be sacred to the sun, as the god of time; and it might probably occur to Polematas, or to any one else who knew that the equable solar year had been and still was the only standard and measure of annual time in the sense of civil—(in comparison of which and its antiquity, the Julian year was an innovation of recent date,) it might naturally, we say, occur to any one who was aware of this, to reflect, that an octaëteric solemnity in honour of the sun, as the god of time, was bound to be celebrated in the primitive solar year, not in the Julian. And if it was still remembered (as it possibly might be) that primitive equable time itself, in connection with the present system of things, had set out on the seventh of the first month of the first equable year, (the last day of the heptaëmeron of Scripture, the day after the Creation of man,) it might appear to be just as reasonable that the epoch of such a cycle, kept and reckoned in terms of the primitive year perpetually, should be attached in the first instance to the seventh of the primitive Thoth, rather than to any other day in the equable year.

Now these are the only circumstances of distinction between the Pythian *Ennead* of Philammon and the Parthenian one of Polematas; viz. that the former was an octaëteric cycle reckoned in Julian years, the latter was one reckoned in equable years; the former was attached in the first instance to the seventh of the primitive Athyr, the latter to the seventh of the primitive Thoth. And if these distinctions



were not simply accidental, they must have been the effect of design on the part of the author of the later of these two cycles in particular. We may presume then that the first idea of the Parthenian Ennead was very probably suggested to Polematus by the Pythian, which had been 105 years in existence before his time; but that his own could not have been intended as an imitation of the Pythian so much as for a correction of it—as what the Pythian Ennead itself was bound to have been, in strict conformity to the reason of things, and to the analogy of the Primitive Calendar, and to its professed relation to the Principle of time, whether Apollo or the sun.

On this supposition however it is easy to see that this Ennead of Polematus, reckoned in terms of the equable year, might naturally, in the course of time, come to be regarded as a rival of the Ennead of Philammon; and that not only the honour and dignity of the Pythian Apollo, but the credit and authority of the Delphian oracle, (which came into existence along with it,) would be equally interested in disparaging, and discrediting, and if possible suppressing, this rival cycle. And that this construction must actually have been put upon it, may be inferred from the classical fable of Tityus, which seems to have grown up out of it.

This fable, considered in itself, is one of those extravagant fictions of ancient mythology which at first sight might be considered incapable of any rational and consistent explanation. But let it only be assumed that the Tityus of this fable was the impersonation of an octaëteric cycle, like the Ennead of Polematus, reckoned in terms of the equable year perpetually, as the Pytho of the Pythian fable was that of one of eight Julian years—and as a rival institution of its kind to that of Delphi—and it ceases to be inexplicable. It is perceived to have a meaning, and something even like a foundation in the matter of fact.

For, in the first place, the name of the Tityus of this fable is evidently one of the same stamp, and cast in the same mould, as that of the Titans, in the fable of the battle of the gods and the Titans, which we explained in the third Dissertation P. The etymon of both must have been the same—

the Egyptian Ta-ti, or Ti-ta. It is only an accident that in one of these instances this Egyptian name assumed the form of *Τιτὰς* or *Τιτὰν* in Greek, and in the other that of *Τιτυός*. And if this name of *Τιτὰν* in the former could denote the impersonation of the Primitive Equable Calendar in contradistinction to the Julian; it was just as possible that this other name of *Τιτυός* might be purposely invented to denote the impersonation of an octaëteric cycle of eight equable years in contradistinction to one of eight Julian.

Secondly, with regard to the circumstances of this fable; Tityus, the principal subject thereof, was of Bœotian origin, being supposed the son of Elare, daughter of Orchomenus: and this cycle of eight equable years was of Bœotian origin too. He contracted the guilt of the offence for which he was punished in the manner described by the fable, by an attempt on the honour of the Lato of the Pythian fable, the mother of the Apollo and the Artemis of that fable; and the instrumental agency by which this offence was resented and punished at the time was that of the Apollo of the Pythian fable himself, and as the first of the exploits, next to the destruction of the serpent Pytho, by which his divinity was affirmed and attested—

Ἐν καὶ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος οἷστεύων ἐτέτυκτο,  
βούπαις οὐπω πολλὸς, εἴην ἐρύοντα καλύπτρης  
μητέρα θαρσαλέως Τιτυὸν μέγαν, ὃν ῥ' ἔτεκέν γε  
δὲ Ἐλάρη, θρέψεν δὲ καὶ ἄψ' ἐλοχεύσατο Γαῖα γ.

Καὶ Τιτυοῦ πόλιν εἶδεν, ὅπη θρασὺς υἱὸς ἀρούρης  
ἄλσεια καλλιπέτηλα διαστείχων Πανοπήος  
ἀγνὰ βιαζομένης ἀνεσεύρασε φάρεα Λητοῦς γ.

Ὁ μὲν Τιτυὸς μέγας ἦν καλὸς δὲ οὐ. ὅτι δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐτελεύτησε τοξευθεὶς καὶ Φερεκυδῆς φησί<sup>s</sup>—Τιτυὸν δὲ Ἀπόλλων τοξέυει καὶ Ἄρτεμις<sup>t</sup>—Κτείνει δὲ μετ' οὐ πολὺν καὶ Τιτυὸν, ὃς ἦν Διὸς υἱὸς καὶ τῆς Ὀρχομενοῦ θυγατρὸς Ἐλάρης ... οὗτος ἐρχόμενος (lege ἐρχομένην) εἰς Πυθῶ Λητῶ θεωρήσας πόθῳ κατασχεθεὶς ἐπισπάται\*· ἣ δὲ τοῖς παιῖδας ἐπικαλεῖται, καὶ κατατοξεύ-

\* Lato or Leto, as we shall see hereafter, being the impersonation of the air or atmosphere, the mother of the two principles, (Apollo and Arte-

<sup>q</sup> Apollonius Rhod. i. 759. cf. the Scholia.

<sup>r</sup> Nonnus, iv. 331. De Cadmo: cf. Iliad. B. 520. and the Schol. ad (Edip.

Tyr. 733.

<sup>s</sup> Scholia in Pind. ad Pyth. iv. 160.

καὶ μὲν Τιτυόν.

<sup>t</sup> Pausanias, iii. xviii. 9.

ουσιν αὐτόν. κολάζεται δὲ καὶ μετὰ θάνατον γῦπες γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν ἐν Ἄιδου ἐσθίουσιν<sup>v</sup>.

It may well be supposed that, whosoever was the inventor of this fable, in which Tityus was personified and proposed as the type of a rival cycle in Bœotia to the Pythian one at Delphi, he would take care to represent it as the first of the duties or acts of the Pythian Apollo to destroy the impersonation of this rival cycle; and that being the end proposed and answered by his death, it was of little importance in what manner it was brought about, provided it was through the instrumentality of Apollo. The attempt on the person of Lato, the mother of Apollo, was the immediate cause of this interposition; but Lato even then was on her way to Pytho or Delphi, and passing through Panopeus or Panope for that purpose, when she was exposed to the violence of Tityus; and very probably going to attend the first Pythian solemnity itself: for Apollo, in whose honour that was instituted, was still young—*βούπαις οὐπω πολλὸς* (no very big boy—when he performed this exploit on Tityus.

Thirdly, with respect to the treatment of Tityus after his death, according to Homer, (the first and oldest authority for it to which we can refer at present,) it consisted in his being condemned to lie helpless, and stretched out over an expanse of nine plethra, while vultures devoured his liver—

Καὶ Τιτυὸν εἶδον Γαίης ἔρικυδέος υἱὸν  
κείμενον ἐν δαπέδῳ· ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἐννέα κείμετο πέλεθρα·  
γῦπε δέ μιν ἐκάτερθε παρημένω ἦπαρ ἔκειρον,  
δέτρπον ἔσω δύνοντες· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἀπαμύνετο χερσίν·  
Λητὼ γὰρ ἤλκησε, Διὸς κυδρὴν παράκοιτιν,  
Πυθῶδ' ἐρχομένην διὰ καλλιχόρου Πανοπήος<sup>x</sup>.

mis, the sun and the moon,) both concerned in the production of the Pythian cycle, (an octaëteric one of its kind,) the moral of this attempted but unsuccessful violence against the Lato of the Pythian fable, by the Tityus of this fable, which is punished by the intervention of the Pythian Apollo and Artemis themselves, was the incompatibility of equable solar and lunar time with the octaëteric solar and lunar: eight equable solar years being two days less than eight octaëteric solar years, and eight equable lunar years (the first eight of the Apis cycle) being 88 days less than eight octaëteric lunar years.

<sup>v</sup> Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, i. iv. § 1.

<sup>x</sup> Odyssey, A. 576. cf. H. 322.

And here, if Tityus himself was the impersonation of a cycle of nine terms, these nine plethra, covered by his body, would be significant. It is implied in this account too, though not distinctly specified by it, that his liver, continually devoured as it was by these two vultures, must nevertheless have continually grown again; and so far that would be typical of a cycle, the essence of which consists in beginning again as soon as it has come to an end. Both these circumstances appear in Hyginus' account of the fable, with this difference, that in his a serpent devours the liver, not two vultures; and a serpent was early adopted by the ancients as the type of a cycle; and this serpent, which even in the Shades thus consummates the vengeance of the Pythian Apollo on Tityus, might be the Pythian serpent itself. Hyginus adds too, that the liver, as often as it was devoured, grew again, but with *the moon*; and that was an addition which could scarcely have been made, except by some one who knew that Tityus himself was the type of a lunar cycle.

## DISSERTATION IX.

### *On the Carnea of Hellenic Antiquity, and the Carnean Ennead.*

---

#### CHAPTER I.

---

##### SECTION I.—*Testimonies.*

We shall begin our inquiries into this institution, and into the date of the Ennead, instituted along with it, by collecting the testimonies of antiquity (the principal part of them at least, and such as have not been anticipated in any former part of this work<sup>z</sup>) to the Carnea; the occasion out of which they arose, the appellation by which they were called, the reason thereof, and the like.

i. Ὁ δὲ Καρνεῖος, ὃν Οἰκέταν ἐπονομάζουσι, τιμὰς εἶχεν ἐν Σπάρτῃ καὶ πρὶν Ἡρακλείδᾳ καταλθεῖν, ἴδρυτο δὲ ἐν οἰκίᾳ Κριοῦ τοῦ Θεοκλέους ἀνδρὸς μάντεως. τούτου δὲ τοῦ Κριοῦ γεμιζούσῃ τῇ θυγατρὶ ὕδωρ συντυχόντες κατάσκοποι τῶν Δωριέων, αὐτῇ τε ἀφικουτο ἐς λόγους, καὶ παρὰ τὸν Κριὸν ἐλθόντες διδάσκονται τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Σπάρτης. Κάρνειον δὲ Ἀπόλλωνα Δωριεῦσι τοῖς πᾶσι σέβεσθαι καθέστηκεν ἀπὸ Κάρνου γένος ἐξ Ἀκαρνανίας, μαντευομένου δὲ ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος. τούτου γὰρ τὸν Κάρνου ἀποκτείναντος Ἴππότου τοῦ Φύλατος, ἐνέπεσεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς Δωριεῦσι μήνιμα Ἀπόλλωνος, καὶ Ἴππότης τε ἔφυγεν ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ, καὶ Δωριεῦσιν ἀπὸ τούτου τὸν Ἀκαρνᾶνα μάντιν καθέστηκεν ἰλάσκεσθαι. ἀλλὰ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις οὐχ οὗτος ὁ Οἰκέτας ἐστὶ Καρνεῖος, ὁ δὲ ἐν (τῷ) τοῦ μάντεως Κριοῦ τιμώμενος, Ἀχαιῶν ἔτι ἐχόντων τὴν Σπάρτην. Πραξίλλη μὲν δὴ πεποιημένα ἐστίν, ὡς Εὐρώπῃς εἶη Καρνεῖος, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνεθρέψατο Ἀπόλλων καὶ Λητώ. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ἐπ' αὐτῷ λόγος· ἐν τῇ Ἰδῇ τῇ Τρωϊκῇ κρανείας ἐν Ἀπόλ-

<sup>z</sup> Vol. iii. page 571. Calendar of Cyrene.

λωνος ἄλσει πεφυκίας τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐκτεμεῖν ἐς τοῦ ἵππου τοῦ δουρίου τὴν ποιήσιν· μαθόντες δὲ ὄργην σφισιν ἔχειν τὸν θεόν, θυσίαις ἰλάσκονται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα ὀνομάζουσι Κάρνειον, (Κρανεῖον,) ὑπὲρ τῶν κρανειῶν, μεταθέντες τὸ ῥῶ κατὰ δὴ τι ἀρχαῖον<sup>a</sup>—Κάρνεα δὲ ἑορτὴ Ἀπόλλωνος Καρνεῖον ἀπότινος Κάρνου. οὗτος δὲ ὁ Κάρνος μάντις ὣν εἴπετο τοῖς Ἡρακλείδαις, ἄσημα τούτοις μαντευόμενος. ὄντινα ἐκτραπεῖς εἰς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν, Ἰππότης τοῦνομα, λόγχῃ βαλὼν ἀπέκτεινεν. δι' ὃν λοιμὸς ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ· καὶ ἀπελθόντες ἔλαβον χρησμὸν ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος, Κάρνειον τιμῆσαι Ἀπόλλωνα<sup>b</sup>—Κάρνεα ἑορτὴ Δωρική, τελουμένη Καρνεῖ<sup>c</sup> Ἀπόλλωνι κατὰ τὴν Πελοπόννησον, ἀπὸ Κάρνου μάντεως, ὃς ἔχρησε τοῖς Ἡρακλείδαις· ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δὲ Κάρνειον Ἀπόλλωνα προσαγορεύουσιν. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ<sup>c</sup>—Ἵτι τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ Δία καὶ Ἠγήτορα καλοῦσιν Ἀργεῖοι, διὰ τὸ Κάρνον ἡγήσασθαι τοῦ στρατοῦ· ὃν οἱ Ἡρακλεῖδαι ἀπέκτειναν ἀπερχόμενοι εἰς Πελοπόννησον, ὑπολαβόντες κατάσκοπον εἶναι τοῦ στρατεύματος, ὃν ὕστερον ἐτίμησαν, ὑπὸ λοιμοῦ φθειρόμενοι<sup>d</sup>—Πραξίλας (Πράξιλλα) μὲν ἀπὸ Καρνεῖου φησὶν ὠνομάσθαι, τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Εὐρώπης υἱοῦ, ὃς ἦν ἐρώμενος τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. Ἀλκμὰν δὲ ἀπὸ Καρνεοῦ τιμὸς Τρωϊκοῦ. Δημήτριος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κράναι, ὃ ἐστὶ τελέσαι. φησὶ γὰρ ὡς ὁ Μενέλαος στρατεύσας εἰς Ἴλιον ἠῤῥατο τιμῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐὰν κραλῆ<sup>e</sup>... Ἀγητῆς... ἐν δὲ τοῖς Καρνεῖοις ὁ ἱερώμενος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἑορτὴ, Ἀγητόρια<sup>f</sup>—Ἀγητόρειον· ἑορτὴ<sup>g</sup>.

ii. Μεταστάντος δὲ Ἡρακλέους εἰς θεοὺς... Ἵλλος... παραγενόμενος εἰς Δελφοὺς, ἐπνυθάνετο, πῶς ἂν κατέλθοιεν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἔφησε, περιμείναντας τὸν τρίτον καρπὸν κατέρχεσθαι. νομίσας δὲ Ἵλλος τρίτον καρπὸν λέγεσθαι τὴν τριετίαν, τοσοῦτον περιμείνας χρόνον κ', τ. λ. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἠνδρώθησαν οἱ Κλεολάου (Κλεοδαίου) παῖδες, ἐχρῶντο περὶ καθόδου, τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος ὅτι καὶ τὸ πρότερον, Τήμενος ἠτιάτο, λέγων τούτῳ πεισθέντα ἀτυχήσαι. ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀντεῖπε, τῶν ἀτυχημάτων αὐτοὺς αἰτίους εἶναι· τοὺς γὰρ χρησμοὺς οὐ συμβάλλειν· λέγειν γὰρ οὐ γῆς, ἀλλὰ γενεᾶς, καρπὸν τρίτον, καὶ στενυγρὰν τὴν εὐρυγαστορα, δεξιὰν κατὰ τὸν Ἴσθμὸν ἔχοντι τὴν θάλασσαν. ταῦτα Τήμενος ἀκούσας, ἠτοίμαζε τὸν στρατὸν, καὶ ναῦς ἐπήξατο τῆς Λοκρίδος ἔνθα νῦν ἀπ' ἐκείνου ὁ τόπος Ναυπάκτος λέγεται... συνέβη δὲ καὶ τὸν στρατὸν ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ συμφορᾷ περιπεσεῖν. ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς μάντις χρησμοὺς λέγων καὶ ἐνθεάζων, ὃν ἐνόμισαν μάγον εἶναι, ἐπὶ λύμῃ τοῦ στρατοῦ πρὸς Πελοποννησίω

<sup>a</sup> Pausanias, iii. xiii. 2.<sup>b</sup> Ibid.<sup>c</sup> Ibid.<sup>d</sup> Ibid.<sup>e</sup> Schol. in Theocrit. Idyll. v. 83. ἐφέρπει.<sup>f</sup> Ibid.<sup>g</sup> Hesychius.<sup>h</sup> Ibid.

ἀπεσταλμένοι. τοῦτοι βαλὼν ἀκοντίῳ Ἰππότης, ὁ Φύλαντος τοῦ Ἀιτιόχου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, τυχὼν ἀπέκτειναι. οὕτως δὲ γενομένου τούτου, τὸ μὲν ναυτικὸν, διαφθαρεισῶν τῶν νεῶν, ἀπώλετο· τὸ δὲ πεζὸν ἠτύχησε λιμῶ (λοιμῶ), καὶ διελύθη τὸ στράτευμα. χρωμένον δὲ περὶ τῆς συμφορᾶς Τημένου, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ μάντεως γενέσθαι ταῦτα λέγοντος, καὶ κελεύοντος φυγαδεῦσαι δέκα ἔτη τὸν ἀνελόντα, καὶ χρῆσασθαι ἡγεμόνι τῷ τριοφθάλμῳ, τὸν μὲν Ἰππότην ἐφυγάδευσαν, τὸν δὲ τριοφθαλμον ἐζήτουν κ', τ. λ. §

iii. Ἐπεὶ δὲ πῶς ἐπεμνήσθη τῷδε τοῦ λόγου, φέρε τὰ καθήκοιτα διέλθω τοῦ κατὰ τοὺς Ἡρακλείδας διηγήματος. οὗτοι γάρ ποθ' ὠρμημένοι κατὰ τὸν Ἴσθμὸν εἰσβαλεῖν εἰς Πελοπόννησον ἐσφάλησαν. Ἀριστόμαχος οὖν ὁ Ἀριδαίου (Κλεοδαίου) ἐπειδὴ ὁ Ἀριδαῖος ἐτεθνήκει ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ ἔρχεται ἀκουσόμενος παρὰ σοῦ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ· ἐπεθύμει δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ πατήρ. σὺ δ' αὐτῷ λέγεις,

Νίκην σοι φαίνουσι θεοὶ δι' ὁδοῖο στενύγων.

καὶ ὅς κατὰ τὸν Ἴσθμὸν ὠρμησεν ἐπιχειρεῖν, καὶ μάχῃ τελευτᾷ. τούτου υἱὸς ὁ Τήμενος κακοδαίμων ἦκεν ἐκ κακοδαιμόνων τρίτος· σὺ δ' αὐτῷ παρεγγυᾷς ἢ καὶ Ἀριστομάχῳ τῷ πατρί. καὶ ὅς· Ἀλλὰ κακείνός σοι ἔφη πεισθεὶς ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ. καὶ σὺ ἔφης· Οὐ κατὰ γῆν λέγω στενύγρην, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν εὐρυγᾶστορα· ἐπειδὴ χαλεπὸν ἦν εἰπεῖν κατὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. κακείνος ἦει κατὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, δόξαν ἐμπούσας ὅτι κατὰ γῆν εἰσίοι, καὶ μέσον στρατοπεδεύεται Ναάτου (Ναυπάκτου) καὶ Τυπαίου. καὶ διακουτίζει Κάρνον Ἰππότην (Ἰππότης) Φυλάνδρου (Φύλαντος) τὸν Αἰτωλὸν, εὖ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ποιδῶν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ συνεκέρησε γόσος πλησία, καὶ ἀπέθανεν Ἀριστόδημος, πάλιν ἐπανεχώρουν. καὶ ὁ Τήμενος ἐλθὼν ἀπεμέμφετο τῇ ἀποτυχίᾳ, καὶ ἤκουσεν ὅτι ποιῆν ἀνεμάξατο τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγγέλου, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐχῆς Ἀπόλλωνι Καρνίῳ ποίημα, τὸ διὰ τοῦ χρησμῶ λέγον,

Ἄγγελον ἡμέτερον κτεῖνας ἀνεμάξασαι ποιῆν.

Τί οὖν, φησὶν ὁ Τήμενος, τί χρὴ ποιεῖν; καὶ πῶς ἂν ἰλασαίμην ὑμᾶς;

Εὔχεο Καρνείῳ τελέειν σέβας Ἀπόλλωνι<sup>h</sup>.

iv. Καρνείος Ἀπόλλων ἀπό τινος Κάρνου μάντεως, οὗ φονευθέντος ὑπὸ Ἀλήτου τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου, ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Ἀπόλλων λοιμὸν ἐνέβαλεν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ αὐτῶν. θέλοντες νῦν ἐξιλεώσασθαι τὸν θεὸν ἐποίησαν αὐτοῦ ἑορτὴν, καλέσαντες αὐτὴν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κάρνου

§ Apollod. Biblioth. ii. viii. 1-3. cf. Schol. in Pind. ad Olymp. iii. 19. ὧτι κτείνων.

<sup>h</sup> Eusebius, Præp. Evang. v. 20. 445. Ex Enomao, De Oraculis. cf. Strabo, viii. 3. 172, 173 : 176, 177.

Καρνεϊαν<sup>i</sup>—'Απὸ Κάρνου τοῦ μάντεως, τοῦ ἀναιρεθέντος ὑπὸ Ἀλήτου, ὃς ἦν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν. ὀργισθεὶς οὖν Ἀπόλλων λοιμὸν ἐνέβαλεν<sup>k</sup>—'Ἡ κς' διέξιςιν ὡς φάσμα Ἀπόλλωνος, ὄνομα Κάρνος, Δωριεῦσιν ἐπόμενον Ἰππότης τις τῶν ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους ἀναιρεῖ, ὅτε κατήεσαν εἰς Πελοπόννησον Ἡρακλεῖδαι. καὶ λοιμοῦ τούτου προσπεσόντος χρησμὸν λαβόντες ἤλασαν τὸν Ἰππότην τοῦ στρατοπέδου. μάντις δ' ἦν τὸ φάσμα τοῖς Δωριεῦσιν. Ἡρακλεῖδαις μὲν κάθοδος εἰς Πελοπόννησον ἐγένετο, ὃ δ' Ἰππότης ἀλώμενος τίκτει παῖδα, ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος Ἀλήτην καλέσας<sup>l</sup>—'Ἰμμιν δὲ παῖδες Ἀλάτα<sup>m</sup>. τουτέστιν οἱ Κορίνθιοι. Ἀλήτης γὰρ ἠγήσατο τῆς ἀποικίας τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν, ὅτε οἱ Ἡρακλεῖδαι κατήεσαν εἰς Πελοπόννησον, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς ἃν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν. ἦν γὰρ Ἰππότου τοῦ Φύλαντος τοῦ Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. οὗτος ἐκράτησε Κορίνθου. διόπερ παῖδας εἶπεν Ἀλήτου τοὺς Κορινθίους, ὡς ἀπογόνους. Δίδυμος δὲ φησὶ τὸν Ἀλήτην μὴ οἰκιστὴν τῆς Κορίνθου γεγονέναι, ἀλλὰ βασιλέα, ἔτει τριακοστῷ μετὰ τὴν τῶν Δωριέων ἄφιξιν—'Ἀλήτης<sup>n</sup>. ὃ Ἡρακλέους ἀπόγονος, ὃ τῆς Κορίνθου βασιλεὺς υἱὸς δὲ Ἰππότου· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι Ἀλητίδαι. εἶρηται (δὲ) ὅτι Ἰππότης διὰ τὸν Κάρνιδος φόνον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ἐκβληθεὶς καὶ ληστεύων (ἀλητεύων) ἔσχεν αὐτόν· ... σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸν πλανήτην.

v. Καρνεῖος<sup>o</sup>. Ἐπίθετον Ἀπόλλωνος· ἴσως ἀπὸ Κάρνου τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Εὐρώπης—Κάρνιος· Ἀπόλλων p—Κάρνια· Ἀπόλλωνος ἑορτὴ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους q\*—Apollo ... Καρνεῖος ὅτι καιόμενος ὀράται νέος: vel quod cum omnia ardentia consumantur hic suo calore candens semper novus constat<sup>r</sup>—Καρνεῖος δ' ἦν μὴν, ἱερομηνία Δωριεῦσιν s—Τοῦ γὰρ Καρνεῖου πολλὰς ἔχοντος ἱερὰς ἡμέρας, ἣ καὶ πάσας ἱερὰς μᾶλλον, οὐκ ἐστρατεύοντο<sup>t</sup>.

vi. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Σκήψιος, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ Διακόσμου, τὴν τῶν Καρνεῖων φησὶν ἑορτὴν παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους μίμημα εἶναι στρατιωτικῆς ἀγωγῆς. τόπους μὲν γὰρ εἶναι ἐννέα τῷ ἀριθμῷ· σκιαῶδες δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦνται, σκηναῖς ἔχοντες παραπλήσιον

\* Καρνεῖωνος also (but without any example of its use) occurs in Suidas, and would be the genitive of Καρνεῖων, the Attic form of the name of Καρνεῖος—the month of the Carnea.

<sup>i</sup> Schol. in Pindar. ad Pyth. v. 106. Καρνεῖ' ἐν δαιτί.

<sup>k</sup> Schol. in Callimachum, Hymn. ad Apoll. 71. Καρνεῖον.

<sup>l</sup> Photii Bibl. Codex 186. 135. 22. Conon. Διηγῆσεις, κς'.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. in Pind. ad Olymp. xiii. 17.

<sup>n</sup> Etym. M.

<sup>o</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>p</sup> Suidas.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Macrobius, Saturn. i. 17. 294.

<sup>s</sup> Thucyd. v. 54.

<sup>t</sup> Schol. in loc.



τι καὶ ἐννέα καθ' ἕκαστον ἄνδρες δειπνοῦσι, πάντα τε ἀπὸ προστάγματος κηρύσσεται. ἔχει τε ἐκάστη σκιάς φρατρίας τρεῖς, καὶ γίνεται ἡ τῶν Καρνείων ἑορτὴ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ἐννέα<sup>v</sup>—Κατὰ τὸν ἱστορήσαντα ὡς ἡ τῶν Καρινῶν παρὰ Λάκωσιν ἑορτὴ μίμημα ἦν στρατιωτικῆς ἀγωγῆς. τόποι μὲν γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐννέα τῶ ἀριθμῶ, σκιάδες μὲν καλούμενοι, σκηναῖς δέ τι ἔχοντες παραπλήσιον ἐννέα δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἄνδρες ἐδείπνουσιν, φιλίᾳ ἴσως καὶ ἐκεῖ ἀριθμοῦ Ὀμήρου φίλου, τοῦ ἐννέα· διὸ καὶ ἐπάγει ὁ τοῦθ' ἱστορήσας τό· Γίνεται δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἐννέα<sup>x</sup>.

SECTION II.—*Observations on the preceding testimonies; and inferences from them.*

It appears from these testimonies that, as an epithet of Apollo, the title of Carneus was older at Sparta than any such event as the return of the Heraclidæ; but only as that of an object of worship to one family, as that of an Apollo Οἰκέτας, an household or domestic Apollo. It appears too that, in point of etymon, the name of this Apollo was derived from that of the cornel tree, Κράνεια, and therefore that its first and oldest form was Κρανεῖος not Κάρνειος; and with respect to its origin, tradition traced it back to something which happened at Troy in the last year of the siege. As another mark of discrimination too between this private Apollo, and the object of reverence to the Dorian family, the name of the former, whether Κρανεῖος or Καρνεῖος, was what the grammarians called an oxytone (i. e. accentuated on the last syllable), that of the latter a perispomenon, Καρνεῖος, or a properispomenon, Κάρνειος, for it is found accentuated both ways. These are circumstances of distinction which must effectually prevent the Apollo Carneus of the Trojan æra (if there was truly such an one) from being confounded with the Apollo Carneus of the Dorians.

The explanation therefore which derived this name from the Κράνεια of the Trojan æra may be set aside, as inapplicable to the name of the latter. As little regard is due to the etymon, proposed by Didymus, from κραίνειν in the sense of τελέσαι, to ratify, to perform, to finish, which also would trace back the name to the Trojan æra. In like man-

<sup>v</sup> Athenæus, iv. 19.

<sup>x</sup> Eustath. ad Iliad. Ω. 802 : 1376. 45. cf. Mr. Clinton's Fasti, i. 129, 130, note m.

ner we may dismiss the definition assigned by Macrobius; Παρὰ τὸ καίόμενος ἀεὶ νέος φαίνεσθαι: which has nothing to recommend it, except the assumption on which it is based, viz. that Carneus was one of the titles of the sun.

Among the explanations then of this name of the Dorian Apollo, which appear in the preceding statements, none remains but that which derived it from Κάρνος, the proper name of some individual of former times; and accounted for its origin by a certain fact in the personal history of this Carnus, handed down traditionally from the time of the return of the Heraclidæ. It is evident that in this explanation the major part of the above testimonies were agreed; and that in their respective accounts of the fact itself, out of which the name arose, there was little or no circumstantial difference: that, according to all of them, Carnus was a soothsayer, commissioned, or believed to be commissioned, by Apollo to take part in his name in the third and last attempt of the Heraclidæ to return; that, whether intentionally or unintentionally, he was killed by one of their leaders on this occasion; and that in order to appease the anger of Apollo, for the injury done to himself in the person of his prophet, and as an atonement to the manes of the prophet, and as a means of perpetuating his memory, a festival, called after his name, was expressly instituted. It cannot be denied that on grammatical principles such an etymology is unexceptionable; that such an adjective as Κάρνεος or Καρνεῖος would be regularly derivable from Κάρνος; and that, if we accept the tradition which accompanied the etymology, we have in both a natural and consistent explanation of the name both of the Carnean Apollo and of the Carnean solemnity.

Now, though objections might certainly be made to some of the particulars in the preceding accounts, which, at this distance of time, and in the absence of all further information relating to the same subject, it would not be easy to answer; yet on the whole, it may be fairly maintained that nothing is discoverable in them which may not have been founded in fact. They are consistent with all that is known at present of the history of the return. It is agreed that the last, and only successful, attempt of this kind, was made in the third

generation from Hercules; and Hippotes, to whom the death of Carnus was attributed, stood third in descent from Hercules. It is agreed also that, for this act, he in particular was banished by the rest of the Heraclidæ—and that circumstance of his personal history was attested by the name of his son, who afterwards reigned at Corinth; born during his exile, while he was still a wanderer, and therefore called Ἀλίττης, or the wanderer. It is agreed too that this last invasion of the Peloponnese by the Heraclidæ was made by sea, across the gulf of Corinth, from the opposite coast of Ætolia; and that the ships which were wanted for this purpose were built at Naupactus, so called from that circumstance itself: and this Carnus, the subject of the violence of Hippotes, was an Acarnanian also, and came by his death, through this act of Hippotes, while the Heraclidæ and he were still on the Acarnanian or Ætolian side of the gulf. In short, we want an explanation of the appearance of an Apollo Κάρρειος, from the time of the return of the Heraclidæ, and an Apollo so styled, both proposed and recognised as the National object of worship to the Dorian branch of the Hellenic community, and to none of the members of the same great family besides; and this tradition relating to the circumstances of the return, to Carnus, to Apollo, and to the institution of the Carnean solemnity, supplies that desideratum: but nothing else does so, which has come down to posterity in any other form.

The cause or motive indeed of the death of Carnus has not been distinctly explained, and that is the most doubtful, because the most obscure, part of the tradition. Some of the preceding accounts attribute it to the obscurity of his own predictions, which prevented his being understood and recognised as the prophet of Apollo; others, to his having been mistaken for a spy of the Peloponnesians, purposely sent to mislead the Heraclidæ. We may infer therefore that his death was in some manner or other the consequence of a misapprehension of his real character; which, if true, renders the fact of his death itself *a priori* so much the more probable. And though it was added that the death was followed by a pestilence in the army of the Heraclidæ, without calling in question the possibility of such a coincidence, soon after his

death, yet with respect to the construction put upon it, that appears to have originated first with the Delphian oracle, not with the Heraclidæ themselves; and nothing would be more probable *a priori* than that, if Carnus had appeared on this occasion in the character of the messenger and prophet of Apollo, and yet had been put to death by the Heraclidæ in the manner handed down by tradition, even a natural occurrence in the shape of a plague, or a pestilential state of things, which might have followed soon after his death, would be interpreted and explained by those, who had the management of the oracle of Delphi, as a judgment upon the Heraclidæ for his death.

This account however of the return in general is consistent in representing the proceedings of the Heraclidæ, with a view both to the return and to the expiation of the death of Carnus, as directed by the oracle; for both that and the Pythian Apollo had long been in existence, and long been recognised, before this return. The antiquity of the Carnean Apollo is attested by the fact, which is mentioned incidentally by Pausanias; viz. that his temple, originally, had neither walls nor roof, simply pillars or columns: for that was a characteristic of the worship of the sun, of the highest antiquity, being founded ultimately on the conviction that, to suppose the presence of the sun confined within the limits of a walled and roofed building, was inconsistent with his nature and attributes, as the source of light and heat diffused through all space: Τοῦ δὲ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἥρας, ἣν ἰδρύσατο Ἄδραστος, ὀλίγον ἀπωτέρω Καρνείου ναοῦ ἐστὶν Ἀπόλλωνος· κίονες δὲ ἐστήκασιν ἐν αὐτῷ μόνοι, τοίχους δὲ οὐκέτι οὐδὲ ὄροφον οὔτε ἐνταῦθα εὐρήσεις, οὔτε ἐν τῷ τῆς Προδομίας Ἥρας. τοῦτοι γὰρ δὴ Φάλκης ἰδρύσατο ὁ Τημέρευ, τῆς ὁδοῦ οἱ τῆς ἐς Σικυῶνα Ἥραν φάμενος ὁδηγὸν ἔσεσθαι<sup>γ</sup>. Hera was the type of the moon, as Apollo was of the sun, and it was not yet considered consistent to confine Hera, i. e. the moon, by walls and roofs, any more than Apollo, i. e. the sun.

In the description of the ceremonial of the Carnea, taken from the Diacosmus Troicus of Demetrius of Skepsis, it is a significant circumstance that each of the *nine σκῆμαι* or *σκιάδες*, there alluded to, comprehended *nine* persons, and these *nine*

<sup>γ</sup> Pausanias, ii. xi. 2. De Corintho.

persons represented *three φρατρίαι* ; three, we may suppose, for each. The Heraclidæ at the time of the return were divisible into three *φρατρίαι* too, and settled in the Peloponnese in three such *φρατρίαι*, and in three different parts of the country, respectively : one under Aristodemus, the father of Eurysthenes and Procles, in Laconia, another, under Cresphontes, in Messenia, the third, under Temenus, in Argolis<sup>2</sup>. This rule of the ceremonial was no doubt as old as the institution of the solemnity itself ; and if so, it must have been founded on this division of the Heraclidæ into three bodies, under three different leaders, at the time.

Moreover, according to the same description, the Carnean observance itself, at Sparta in particular, down to the latest times, in external appearance, had much more the semblance of a military than a civil solemnity of its kind. The Carnean pastime was an imitation and representation of life in the field, rather than in the city ; and while it was still going on, Sparta resembled one great camp, and the citizens an army of soldiers, on active duty, and living in tents. And it should be remembered, that, if actually instituted at the time and on the occasion attested by the preceding accounts, it was just after the conquest of the country, and before the conquerors could yet have had time to settle in their new abodes. They must still have been an army of soldiers, much more than a community of citizens—still living in tents, much more properly than within walls and under roofs. They had just won their possessions by the sword, and they were still holding them by the sword. We conclude then that the tradition of Grecian antiquity, which connected the institution of the Carneia with the return of the Heraclidæ, and with something which happened at the time of the return, had a good foundation in the matter of fact. And that being the case, it is necessary, in order to the prosecution of our inquiries into the date of the institution, that we should proceed to the determination, if possible, of that of this return.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Apollodorus, Biblioth. ii. viii. 4, 5 : Herod. viii. 131 : Strabo, viii. ad fin. Pausanias, iii. i. 4, 5 : iv. iii. 3 : ii. xviii. 6 : xix. 1.

SECTION III.—*On the date of the return of the Heraclidæ.*

The chronologers of antiquity are commonly found to refer the date of this event either to that of the capture of Troy, as an earlier one of its kind, or to that of the Ionic migration, as a later; and it is very observable that, whatsoever date they adopt for the capture of Troy, they generally date the return of the Heraclidæ eighty years after it: as if, for some reason or other, it was well understood that the return of the Heraclidæ to their own country was actually neither more nor less than this number of years later than the capture of Troy. Mr. Clinton has collected the opinions and statements of the ancients on each of these points<sup>a</sup>, which makes it unnecessary for us to do so here. It may suffice for our purpose, at present, to remind the reader that Thucydides was one of those who dated the return eighty years after the capture of Troy; and as we saw in the last Dissertation, while he dated *this* event just eighty years after the capture, he dated *another*, the true time of which we have determined to B. C. 1117, just sixty years after the capture. This was the return of the Bœotians from Arne, in Thessaly, to their own country, attested and commemorated by the institution and observance of the Parthenian Ennead.

Now the date of this return being sixty years later than the capture of Troy, and that of the return of the Heraclidæ being eighty years later than the capture of Troy, this return of the Bœotians was twenty years earlier than that return of the Heraclidæ. Consequently, if the date of the return of the Bœotians, attested, as we have seen, by that of the Parthenian Ennead, was B. C. 1117, the date of the return of the Heraclidæ must have been B. C. 1097. And if this was the date of the return, it may reasonably be presumed the next year, B. C. 1096, must have been the date of the institution of the Carnea, which could not have been as early as the year of the return, and yet could not have been later than the year after it. We shall see, we trust, as we proceed, that this distinction is well founded, and agreeable to the

<sup>a</sup> Fasti Hellenici, i. 106 sqq.

matter of fact \*. But we must first of all shew that the institution of the Carnean solemnity at a given time was accompanied at the same time by that of an ennead, or octaëteris, intended for its regulation.

SECTION IV.—*On the institution of the Carnean Ennead along with the Carneæ, B. C. 1096.*

The first observation which may be made, in order to prepare the way for a right judgment on this further question, whether the institution of a solemnity like the Carneæ, at this time, would or would not be accompanied by that of a Carnean Ennead also, is *this*; That both the theory and the application of the octaëteric cycle were well understood among the Greeks long before this time. The first cycle of that kind had been introduced in B. C. 1260; and subsequent to the first appearance of such a cycle in Crete, the Pythian Ennead of Philammon of Delphi, B. C. 1222, and the Panathenaïc Ennead of Theseus, B. C. 1206, and even the Parthenian Ennead of Polematas, B. C. 1117, (which, though applied *de facto* to the primitive equable year, was founded at bottom on the application of the same cycle of eight years to the Julian year,) had completely familiarised the Greeks to both the principles and the praxis of the invention of Minos. It will be seen too, we hope, in the next Dissertation, that the institution of the Hyakinthian solemnity at Sparta, only a few years later than that of the Carnean, was accompanied with the institution of an Hyakinthian Ennead also. Nothing therefore, at this period in the history of time and of the Calendar, can justly be considered less improbable *a priori*

\* There is no inconsistency between this date of the return of the Heraclidæ, B. C. 1096, and the uniform tradition of antiquity, which represents the return itself to have taken place in the third generation from Hercules. Hippotes, one of the leaders of the Heraclidæ, on this occasion, stood in that relation to Hercules, being his greatgrandson: Antiochus, Phylas, Hippotes. If Hercules was born B. C. 1260, (as we may probably see hereafter,) and died about B. C. 1208, Antiochus, his son, was no doubt then alive, but we are at liberty to assume he might still have been very young. There might consequently be as much as 80 years between the death of Hercules, B. C. 1208, and the birth of Hippotes, B. C. 1128—and Hippotes, B. C. 1096, might not be more than 32 or 33 years of age.

than that the institution of a particular solemnity would be accompanied with that of a particular Ennead.

ii. According to the Scholia on Pindar<sup>b</sup>, where they were giving an account of the migration of the Ægeidæ, or descendants of Ægeus, from Thebes to Sparta, on occasion of the war between the Spartans and the people of Amyclæ; the messengers from Sparta found the Ægidæ celebrating some feast of Apollo at Thebes, which the same Scholia, in another allusion to this subject<sup>c</sup>, represent as the feast of the Carnean Apollo: Τοὺς γὰρ Αἰγείδας κατὰ χρησμόν ἀπὸ Θηβῶν λαβόντες ἀπὸ ἐορτῆς Καρνέων Ἀπόλλωνος δειπνοῦντας ἐπήγαγον. This fact, if true, would imply that the Carneæ were already in being; and that would agree with our assumed date of their institution, B. C. 1096, 24 years earlier than this visit to Thebes, B. C. 1072. But there is reason to doubt the truth of the fact, as simply so stated: because the Thebans, among whom this branch of the Ægidæ were living at the time, belonged to the Æolian division of the great Hellenic family, and these Ægidæ to the Ionic; and the Carnean observance was confined to the Dorian. And, in fact, we know from the testimony of Pindar, in this very ode<sup>d</sup>, that the Ægidæ first learnt to observe the Carneæ after this migration, and among the Spartans.

The truth is, in our opinion, that these Ægidæ were found celebrating a feast of Apollo at Thebes on this occasion; not however a feast of the Carnean Apollo. but, in all probability, the feast of the Ismenian Apollo, older at Thebes, and among the Bœotians, as we have seen, than the Parthenian Ennead itself; the proper name of which was the *Δαφνηφορία*, and the stated date of which was the seventh of the primitive Thoth. The circumstances of this visit of the messengers from Sparta to Thebes, preliminary to the migration of the Ægidæ thence, and the date of the annual observance there, as we hope to see in the next Dissertation, would be entirely consistent with each other. And as the institution of the Hyakinthia, with their proper octaëteric cycle, the same year, was due to this visit; we possess in that fact a probable clue to the tradition that the Ægidæ, before their migration to Sparta, were found celebrating the Carneæ

<sup>b</sup> Isthmia, vi. 18.

<sup>c</sup> Pythia, v. 106.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. 101. 104.



at Thebes. The cycle of the Carnea was the same with that of the Hyakinthia; and the epoch of the former having been B. C. 1096, and that of the latter B. C. 1072, the first Hyakinthian Ennead and the fourth Carnean would be in course the same year, with a few days' interval between them. It is evident then that tradition in this instance might have confounded one with the other; and from the fact that this confusion appears to have been actually made, we may infer that there was a proper Carnean Ennead as well as a proper Hyakinthian one, related to one another in this peculiar manner.

iii. We learn from the Agis of Plutarch<sup>e</sup>, that the Spartans had an ancient rule of state, (a νόμος παλαιός<sup>f</sup>.) that of watching the heavens (*servandi de colo*) by night, at the end or the beginning of a certain cycle of eight years; the final end of which was either to confirm their kings in the possession of their office, from the beginning to the end of one of these cycles, or to suspend them from the enjoyment of it, until the will of the gods, concerning any further proceedings, (which might possibly issue out in their being deposed from it,) could be ascertained through the oracle at Olympia, or that of Delphi: a rule which, having probably long been in abeyance, or only observed *pro forma*. was revived on this occasion in the lifetime of Agis by the ephor Lysander, in order to get rid of the king Leonidas, who was opposed to his reforms and those of Agis: Ταῦτα κατὰ τοῦ Λεωνίδου λέγειν ἑτέρους διδάξας, αὐτὸς παρεφύλαττε μετὰ τῶν συναρχόντων τὸ σημεῖον. ἔστι δὲ τοιούτῳ δι' ἐτῶν ἑννέα λαβόντες οἱ Ἐφοροὶ νύκτα καθαρὴν καὶ ἀσέληνον σιωπῇ καθέζονται πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέποντες. εἰάν οὖν ἐκ μέρους τινὸς εἰς ἕτερον μέρος ἀστὴρ διέξῃ κρίνουσι τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ὡς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἔξαμαρτάνοντας, καὶ καταπαύουσι τῆς ἀρχῆς μέχρις ἂν ἐκ Δελφῶν ἢ Ὀλυμπίας χρησμὸς ἔλθῃ τοῖς ἡλώκοσι τῶν βασιλέων βοηθῶν<sup>g</sup>.

There is no doubt that even if the origin of this custom had gone no further back than the epoch of the Octaëteric Correction, B. C. 592, it might have been truly called an ancient rule, in the time of Agis and Leonidas; but it is clear, from the context of Plutarch, that it must have been

<sup>e</sup> Cf. supra, vol. ii. 201, note.

<sup>f</sup> Vita, xi.

<sup>g</sup> Agis, xi.

in reality as old as the monarchy, or at least as the institution of the ephorship at Sparta. If therefore this *εἰθούνη* or scrutiny of the kings was regulated by a cycle of eight years, there must have been an Ennead of some kind at Sparta, possibly as old as the kingly government, and certainly as the ephorship. The Carnean Ennead, instituted, as we suppose, only the year after the return of the Heraclidæ, would answer to this description; and that this must have been the cycle, by which the scrutiny was regulated, may be inferred from the fact, that the date of these proceedings of the ephor Lysander having been B. C. 240<sup>h</sup>, and the date of the Carnean Ennead B. C. 1096, there were 856 years, and 107 cycles of eight years, from a given day B. C. 1096 to the same day B. C. 240. So that if a given day B. C. 1096 was the first day of the first of these cycles, the same day B. C. 240 would be the first of the 108th.

iv. It appears from the testimony of Thucydides that the Carnea were celebrated in two consecutive years, B. C. 419 and B. C. 418; from which fact it must be inferred that they were celebrated in his time annually. Nor is there any reason to suppose that if they were celebrated annually in the time of Thucydides, they must not have been celebrated annually from the first. This Dorian festival, in fact, where-soever it appears to have been celebrated, appears to have been celebrated annually. And though that is better ascertained of the rule at Sparta than anywhere else; yet there is a gloss in Hesychius, from which it might be inferred that even at Sparta the Carnea were quadriennial: *Καρνεάται· οἱ ἄγαμοι, κεκληρωμένοι δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ Καρνείου λειτουργίαν· πέντε δὲ ἀφ' ἑκάστης* (sc. *φυλῆς* or *φρατρίας*) *ἐπὶ τετραετίαν ἐλείτουργουν*. These Carneate were no doubt so called from their relation to the Carnean Apollo, and the Carnean solemnity; and what-soever were the services of the Carnean Apollo, the onus and duty of defraying the charges necessary for their performance, it seems, belonged to them: yet for four years only at a time. If so, there was a cycle of Carnean *λειτουργίαι* and Carnean *λειτουργοί*, the period or term of which was a cycle of four years. In what sense, then, could the Carnea have been both

<sup>h</sup> See vol. i. 202.

annual, as we have collected from Thucydides and other testimonies, and quadricennial, as it may be inferred from this testimony of Hesychius?

If there is any difficulty in this distinction, it is explained by the following passage of Athenæus<sup>i</sup>: Τὰ Κάρνεια πρῶτος πάντων Τέρπανδρος νικᾷ, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τε τοῖς ἐρμέτροις Καρνειοίκαϊς καὶ τοῖς καταλογόδην. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ θέσις τῶν Καρνείων κατὰ τὴν ἕκτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, ὡς Σωσίβιός φησι ἐν τῷ περὶ χρόνων. Ἱερώνυμος δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ κιθαροφῶν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πέμπτοι περὶ ποιητῶν, κατὰ Λυκούργου τὸν νομοθέτην τὸν Τέρπανδρόν φησι γενέσθαι, ὃς ἐπὶ πάντων συμφώνως ἱστορεῖται μετὰ τοῦ Ἰφίτου τοῦ Ἡλείου τὴν πρώτην ἀριθμηθεῖσαν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων θέσιν διαθεῖναι<sup>k</sup>. The learned have commonly understood this testimony as if it related to the first institution of the Carneia in any sense, and have generally dated this latter accordingly. This construction however would set the testimony of Athenæus at variance with the tradition of all antiquity, that the Carnean institution was as old as the return of the Heraclidæ; a tradition attested by what appears in Eusebius<sup>l</sup> and Jerome<sup>m</sup>, relative to the succession of Sacerdotes Carnii at Sikyon in particular, from as far back as B. C. 1128, in their reckoning<sup>n</sup>. The truth is, this statement of Athenæus affirms the date not of the Carneia themselves, but of an important addition made to them, long after their institution; that of an ἀγῶν μουσικός. The Carneia had been in existence long before this addition; but there is no proof that there was any contest of music at them, before the date of the addition here specified. Philobrotus Lacon, observes Eusebius in Chron. Olymp. xxvi. 1<sup>o</sup>, in Pentathli certamine tribus Olympiadibus vicit; Carnia primum posita est Lacedæmone citharædorum colluctatio: and it is an obvious inference from this entry not that the Carneia, but the musical contest at the Carneia, the contest of minstrels, or players on the harp, was now for the first time instituted; for the contest itself appears to have been

<sup>i</sup> xiv. 37.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Plutarch, De Musica, iv. ix.

<sup>l</sup> Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 139. ad Ann. 887 or 888.

<sup>m</sup> Thesaurus Temporum, ad Ann. 889.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. Mr. Clinton, F. Hell. i. 30, 31.

<sup>o</sup> Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 285. cf. Jerome, Thes. Tempor. Parian Marble, Epocha xxxv: Anecdota Græca Paris. ii. 143, 4: Anthol. iii. 165: Christodori Epherasis, 111.

restricted to them, and not only the first victor, in this contest, Terpander, but any other, whose name happens to have been recorded, (Phrynis, Timotheus, and others,) appear to have been celebrated players on the harp, (*κιθαρῳδοὶ* of antiquity,) too <sup>p</sup>.

The right construction of this testimony therefore is that the musical Carnea were instituted at this time, but not the Carnea ἀπλῶς; the Carnea became from this time forward an ἀγὼν μουσικὸς, as the Pythia did from B. C. 582 downwards, and the Panathenæa from B. C. 566. And when this addition was made to the ceremonies of the solemnity, it is reasonable to suppose that the order of the Carneatæ was instituted also; and along with it a cycle of four years, both as the term of the office of these Carneatæ, and as the proper cycle of these musical Carnea in contradistinction to the Carnea as before in use, celebrated every year: in other words, of the annual and ordinary Carnea with this addition, once in every four years, of the musical Carnea.

The use then which may be made of this distinction in reference to the present question, of a Carnean Ennead from the first, is this, That, if this addition of the musical Carnea to the ordinary Carnea was intended to discriminate the solemnity so called every fourth year, from the same solemnity, as so called and celebrated every year, it is most reasonable to suppose there was a preexisting Carnean Period of eight years, which it was proposed hereby to divide into two smaller periods of four years. The same thing, as we hope to see hereafter, was done with the Pythian Ennead, when the quadriennial Pythia were instituted; and for the very same purpose. On this principle however, *that* shorter cycle of four years must have been grafted on the longer one of eight years; and if that was the case, either in the *first* or in the *fifth* year of this longer cycle itself—those being the only two natural epochs of the cycle of four years in terms of the cycle of eight, each of them equivalent to one cycle of the Julian leap-year, as the cycle of eight years was to two. It will therefore be a strong confirmation of our assumed date of the Carnean Ennead, B. C. 1096, if it can be

shewn that the date of the Carnean tetraëteris (the musical Carneia with the proper cycle of four years) was actually one of these two years, either the first or the fifth, of the Carnean octaëteris.

Now this is easily demonstrated. Olymp. xxvi. 1 answered to B. C. 676; and the number of years from B. C. 1096 to B. C. 676 being 420, it amounted to 52 cycles of eight years, and four years over of a 53rd. The date of the institution of the musical Carneia, Ol. xxvi. 1, was Cyc. liii. 5 of the Carnean octaëteris, brought down to their time from B. C. 1096. The quadriennial Carneia therefore took their rise in the fifth year of the octennial; and the stated years of the former in the cycle of the latter would be the first and the fifth perpetually. This coincidence, in our opinion, is competent to decide the question, whether there was or was not a proper Carnean Ennead from the first. We shall therefore assume this point for the future, as sufficiently well established.

SECTION V.—*On the stated season of the Carneia in the natural year; and on the Julian Epoch of the Carnean Ennead.*

The first argument of the season of the Carnean solemnity in the natural year is the name of the Tents or Booths under which it was usually celebrated. The proper name of these tents was *Σκιαδες*, not *Σκηραί*; and so peculiar was this to the Carnean booths, or tabernacula, that, after the institution of the musical Carneia, the same name was transferred to the Ὀδεῖον of Sparta, in which these contests of music were held. *Σκιάς· τὸ Ὀδεῖον τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν φωνὴν Σκιάς καλεῖται· οἶκος γὰρ ἐστὶ στρογγύλος· τοὺς δὲ τοιούτους διὰ τὸ τὴν ὄροφὴν ἔχει μίμημα τῶν σκιαδείων σκιάδας οἱ πάλαι προσηγόρευσαν*<sup>1</sup>. This gloss would imply that the name of *σκιάς* was given to any building with a dome or cupola, resembling an umbrella in shape, or even with merely a circular or vaulted roof. But it appears even from itself that the name was peculiar to *one* building of this description at Sparta, the Ὀδεῖον or temple of music and song; and this having been intended and used there, from the first, only for the musical exhibitions at the Carneia, there can be no reasonable doubt that it borrowed its name of *Σκιάς* from the Carnean *Σκηραί*

<sup>1</sup> Etym. M.

or Σκιαδες. Now the name of Σκηναὶ might have been consistent with the military character of the solemnity, as Στρατιωτικῆς διαγωγῆς μίμημα, at any season of the year; but the name of Σκιαδες given to such tents from the first, as strictly characteristic of the Carnean pastime, could have been proper only for the season of summer, and for the hottest part of the summer, when canopies or coverings of some kind would be most necessary, as a protection from the heat of the weather.

Again, both the occasions of the actual celebration of the Carnea, referred to by Thucydides, are determined by the context to the summer season, and to the Julian month of August or of September; and if there was nothing peculiar to these cases in that respect, and the stated season of the Carnea had never undergone any change, this fact too would be demonstrative that their season from the first must have been the summer, and the latter part of the summer.

Again, an allusion to the Carnea, as near at hand, occurs in one of the Idylls of Theocritus:

Καὶ γὰρ ἔμ' Ὀπόλλων φιλέει μέγα, καὶ καλὸν αὐτῷ  
κρίον ἐγὼ βόσκω· τὰ δὲ Κάρνεα καὶ δὴ ἐφέρει τ.

The scene of this Bucolic is evidently laid in the summer<sup>s</sup>. If so, the Carnea must have been notoriously a summer festival, but late, comparatively, in the summer.

Again, it has been seen<sup>t</sup> that, according to Plutarch, the stated Carnean month in the Doric calendars, which had such an observance, corresponded in general to the Attic Metageitnion; and he affirms this coincidence in so many words of the Syracusan Carneus, and the Attic Metageitnion, B. C. 413. In the old Attic octaëteris the earliest date of Metageitnion was July 22, the latest August 17. In the Metonic correction, and its first and normal state, the former was July 25, the latter August 20. On this principle the Doric Carnea must have been celebrated everywhere in general in the Julian August or September.

Again, there is a gloss in Hesychius, on the word Σταφυλοδρομοί—Τινὲς τῶν Καρνεατῶν, παρορμῶντες τοὺς ἐπὶ τρύγγη—from which, even in its present state (though that is probably de-

<sup>r</sup> v. 82.

<sup>s</sup> Cf. vers. 45. 60. 110, 111.

<sup>t</sup> Vol. ii. 386 sqq.

fective) it might be inferred that the stated time and season of the Carneia approximated to, if it did not coincide with, that of the vintage—that the Carneia at least (of whose office we gave an account *supra* <sup>v</sup>) had something to do with the *τρύγη*, *τρυγητός*, or vintage. But to understand this gloss we must compare it with another, under the same word, which occurs in the *Anecdota* of Mr. Bekker <sup>x</sup>: *Κατὰ τὴν τῶν Καρνείων ἑορτὴν στέμματά τις περιθέμενος τρέχει, ἐπευχόμενος τὴ πόλει χρηστόν. ἐπιδιώκουσι δὲ αὐτὸν νέοι, σταφυλοδρόμοι καλούμενοι καὶ ἂν μὲν καταλάβωσιν αὐτὸν ἀγαθόν τι προσδοκῶσι κατὰ τὰ ἐπιχώρια τῆ πόλει, εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦναντίον.* From both together we may infer that it was one of the customs of the Carnean pastime at Sparta to set some one to run, carrying chaplets (wreaths or ribbons) of some kind about his person, and praying while he was running for some good thing, some general blessing, in which all the community was interested; and to set others to run after him, with the understanding and belief that if they could catch him, they would catch the blessing, and secure it to the community; if they could not, they would lose it for that year. And though it is not stated in this latter allusion for what this prayer was commonly intended, it appears even from that, it was something *κατὰ τὰ ἐπιχώρια*, something which concerned the productions of the country and the seasons: and it may be inferred from the former, of Hesychius, and from the name given to these runners in both, of *σταφυλοδρόμοι*, that it must have been in reality a good or a bad vintage. The burden of this prayer was a good vintage — the stake in this race, so to say, on both sides, was a good or a bad vintage. We may conclude then, on the strength of this Carnean custom, that the stated season of the Carnean solemnity must have been that when the grapes were ripening and approaching to maturity, but the question of a good or a bad vintage was still undecided; and that must always have been the case for the climate of Sparta towards the end of August or the beginning of September\*.

\* It does not appear, though both the parties in this contest of running were called *σταφυλοδρόμοι*, that either of them carried *σταφυλαὶ* (bunches

These considerations may lead us to expect to find the proper Julian epoch of the Carnean Ennead, in some day in the Julian August or September. Let it therefore be observed in the last place, that the Carnea having been instituted in obedience to a direct command of the Pythian oracle, and expressly in honour of the Pythian Apollo, only under a name derived from the institution itself, it is scarcely conceivable that the proper epoch of the institution would be fixed without any regard to the proper cycle of the Pythian Apollo, the Pythian Ennead, the most sacred of such cycles known to the Greeks. We hope to see by and by that the Hyakinthian or Amyclæan Ennead, only a few years later than this Carnean one, was not determined without such a reference; much less would the Carnean one be. We must therefore consider what the proper date of the Pythian Ennead, B. C. 1096, would be.

The Pythian Ennead was instituted B. C. 1222, and its Julian epoch was August 26. In the æra therefore of this Ennead, B. C. 1096 corresponded to cycle xvi. 7; and in the seventh year of the cycle the stated Julian epoch was August 18. If then we are not mistaken in supposing that the proper Carnean epoch would not be determined irrespectively of the Pythian for the time being, the Julian date of the Carnean Ennead must have been August 18 or August 19. We hope to see as we proceed that this was actually the case; and we may conclude our observations on this point, at present, with remarking that in that case nothing could be more agreeable to the conclusion, respecting the proper relation of the solemnity to the natural year, to which we have already come.

SECTION VI.—*On the Carnean Feriæ, or the number of days for which the Carnea lasted.*

On the simple question of fact, How long the Carnea lasted? or, What was the number of the Carnean *Feriæ*? the

of grapes) in their hands; simply that the object, or final end of the race, was ἐπὶ σταφυλαῖς, or as Hesychius express it, ἐπὶ τρύγη: an abundant crop of σταφυλαί, a plentiful vintage. There are certain inscriptions still extant in honour of some of these Carnean Σταφυλοδρόμοι. See Corpus Inscript. No. 1387 and 1388, i. iv. 670. Sparta.



testimony of Demetrius of Skepsis, quoted *supra*, supplies all the information which can be required. The Carneia lasted *nine* days. The number of the Carnean *Ferise* was nine. But with respect to the further question, why they were appointed from the first to last *nine* days, and neither more nor less than *nine*, even that testimony gives us no information, though this in reality is the more interesting question of the two. The Carneia, in this circumstance of their duration, stand distinguished from almost all the solemnities of the Greeks, before or after them, of which anything is known, at their first institution at least; except the Olympia of Arche-laus, which, as we saw *y*, whether in imitation of the more ancient rule of the Carneia, or because they were dedicated to the Muses, were also appointed to last nine days. The Eleu-sinian mysteries too, in the course of time, came to last nine days *z*, but at first they lasted only four.

It must have been notorious in the time of Thucydides, that not only at Sparta, but everywhere among the Dorians of the Peloponnese, the Carnean holidays were very numerous; and possibly, from the difference of styles, and of the begin-nings of the months in the respective calendars of these com-munities, were liable to extend over a space of little less than 30 days, before they would be everywhere at an end. And this was probably the reason why, in the first of these in-stances, he characterized the Carnean month as an *ιερομηνία Δωριεῦσιν*; for though *ιερομηνία* is properly applicable to a single day in a given month, which was kept as an holiday *a*, it would be scarcely less applicable to a month, supposed to consist wholly of holidays. And it is clear from the context that many more days than one were intended by it in this in-stance; and so the Scholiast appears to have understood it.

The question therefore which we have to consider is not whether the Carnean solemnity, as a matter of fact, lasted nine days; but taking that for granted, why it was fixed to that number? And here we may begin with observing, that had this question concerned any similar institution among the ancient Romans, we might have thought of deriving this circumstance of its peculiar rule from the Nundinal cycle of

*y* *Supra*, vol. iii. 59 sqq.

*z* *Supra*, iv. 228 sqq.

*a* See vol. i. page 175 note.

ancient Italy; and of finding a parallel to it in that of the Novemdiales Epulæ of the ancient Romans<sup>b</sup>. But the Novemdial of the ancient Romans, though it took its duration from the Nundinal period, was a funeral cycle; and we have not been able to discover any funeral cycle among the ancient Greeks, the term of which was a period of nine days, nor any connection between the Carnean institution and the solemnities in honour of the dead. At some period indeed of the term of mourning, the ancient Greeks had a funeral banquet, which Homer calls *τάφος*<sup>c</sup>, and the common Greek idiom of after-times the *περίδειπνον*: *Τὸ περίδειπνον τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι παρασκευαζόμενον*<sup>d</sup>—*Περίδειπνον*<sup>e</sup> ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀποθανούσιν ἐστίασις γινομένη: and the historian Dio, as often as he had occasion, transferred to the Roman Novemdial: "Ὡστε καὶ τὴν ἐνάτην, τὸ περίδειπνον<sup>f</sup>. But there is no trace of any funereal ennead in Homer; or in the times before or after Homer: nor if there were would it be of any use to illustrate the rule of the Carnean solemnity, simply because there was nothing funereal in it; nothing which would come under the description of Parentalia, nothing which was not strictly and properly festive. Of the Hyakinthia, instituted only 24 years later, it has been left on record that it was a solemnity of a mixed character, partly funereal, and partly festive; funereal as regarded Hyakinthus, festive as regarded Apollo. Of the Carnean institution nothing has been handed down, which would connect it with the dead, except the tradition relating to Carnus, whose death was accidentally the cause of the institution. But even as so occasioned it appears to have been intended from the first, not so much to appease the manes of Carnus, as to propitiate the Apollo of Carnus; to whom it was dedicated, by his own command, under the name of Apollo Carneus. It was therefore from the first strictly a feast of Apollo; and consequently, from the reason of things, and the analogy of every other solemnity among the Greeks in honour of the gods, it could have nothing funereal in its nature.

It is manifest therefore that the explanation of the num-

<sup>b</sup> Cf. our *Origines Kalendarie Italiae*, ii. 6 n.

<sup>c</sup> *Iliad*. Ψ. 29. cf. Ω. 801.

<sup>d</sup> Schol. in loc. cf. Eustathius, 1285. 39: also ad *Il.* Ω. 802: *Od.* Γ. 309.

<sup>e</sup> Photii Lex.

<sup>f</sup> xl. 49.

ber of the Carnean feriæ must probably be sought for in some other characteristic of these early times. And it appears to us that the likeliest explanation of it is to be found in the equable calendar, and in the constitution of the primitive civil month, which being invariably a term of 30 days, was so easily divisible into three periods of ten days each, and appears to have been actually so divided long before the time of Homer; three decads, distinguished even then in the same manner nominally, as those of the lunar month of after-times—the *μῆν ἰστάμενος*, the *μῆν μεσῶν*, and the *μῆν φθίνων*<sup>h</sup>. And in each of these divisions the tenth or last day, for some reason or other, seems to have been discriminated from the rest. There are various instances in Homer, of allusions to the number nine, or to the term of nine days, (that is, to this stated division of each decad of the month, exclusive of the last day only,) which we hope some time or other to bring together: the foundation of which must have been this corresponding division of the month, and this practical distinction of the parts of each decad, whereby the last day, and the preceding nine, for some reason or other, in the minds and apprehensions of the men of these times were habitually discriminated asunder.

This was probably the reason why the duration of the flood of Deucalion, according to tradition, was supposed to have been *nine* days; that so he might land on the summits of mount Parnassus, and offer sacrifice to Jupiter *Φύξιος* there, on the tenth day<sup>i</sup>: and why, before the hunting of the Cædonian boar, Æneus was supposed to have entertained the heroes, assembled on that occasion, nine days, and the hunt itself to have taken place on the tenth<sup>k</sup>: and why Bellerophon, in Homer<sup>l</sup>, is entertained by the king of Lycia nine days, and his errand inquired into on the tenth: and why, as we were told by Philostratus<sup>m</sup>, the annual extinction of the fires at Lemnus, on the anniversary of the Lemnian massacre, lasted nine days. For the date of the Lemnian massacre, and the consequent institution of this custom, (if really a matter of fact, handed down from the earliest times,)

<sup>h</sup> See vol. i. p. 3. and 72.

<sup>i</sup> Apollonius Bibl. i. vii. 2.

<sup>k</sup> *Ibid.* i. viii. 2. cf. i. ix. 1. 2. The

story of Phylacus and Melampus also.

<sup>l</sup> *Il. Z.* 171-175.

<sup>m</sup> *Supra*, page 16.

must have gone back to the æra of the equable calendar; when this mode of dividing the civil month was everywhere in use among the Greeks. All this tends to render it extremely probable *a priori* that on greater and more solemn occasions, (like that of the first institution of the Carnea,) some regard would be paid to those divisions, and to this term of nine days in each.

Here then it is necessary to take into account the relation of the primitive equable month to the Carnean epoch, August 19, B. C. 1096. This year corresponded to Æra Cyc. 2911, when the first of the primitive Thoth was falling May 21 at midnight; and consequently the first of the primitive Chœac on August 19 at midnight: i. e. on the very first of the Carnean feriæ, if attached at this time (as we have supposed) to August 19. This coincidence, in our opinion, along with the preexisting rule of the reckoning of the parts of the equable month, would be competent to explain the number of the Carnean feriæ, as now also determined and prescribed. As they were thus beginning on the first of the month, they might be purposely appointed to last to the ninth, in order to take up the whole of the first decad of this month, from the first inclusive to the ninth inclusive; leaving out the tenth, which for some reason or other must be excluded in such cases, and reserved for some other use and purpose.

With respect then to this Carnean epoch, and at Sparta at least, as we have assumed that if, in determining it, any regard was paid to the Pythian epoch of the time being, it would be either August 18, or August 19—so now the coincidence, just pointed out, determines the actual epoch to August 19. Nor is it improbable *a priori* that in order to keep the Carnean solemnity distinct from the Pythian, it would be fixed in this first instance, at Sparta in particular, one day later than the Pythian epoch, rather than to that day itself. But when we consider the mutual jealousies, rivalries, and antipathies of the different communities of the Dorians in the Peloponnese, and how soon they began to operate, (almost from the very day of the return of the Heraclidæ,) it will not appear extraordinary, should it turn out that the Carnean epoch in some other instances was differently as-

sumed; that among the Argives, for instance, (as we may have reason to conclude hereafter,) instead of being attached to the day after the Pythian epoch of the time being, it was attached to that epoch itself, August 18; and among the Corinthians the difference between their proper type of the Carnean ennead, and this of the Spartans, was something still greater. There is reason at least to believe, that the Syracusan type of this ennead must have borne date a month later than the Spartan, and either September 18, or September 17, instead of August 19, or August 18; and as the Syracusan type must have been derived from the Corinthian, what appears to have held good of the former, may be presumed to have been true of the latter.

These distinctions, after all, were accidental, and did not concern the essence of the Carnean observance. And such as they are, they are easily to be accounted for by the natural operation of the feelings alluded to, which predisposed one of these communities purposely to affect the appearance of independence on another. In the case of the Corinthians however the difference of types might be explained merely by means of the peculiar circumstances under which that part of the Dorian community, which ultimately settled at Corinth, first got possession of it: for these were the followers of Hippotes, under his son Aletes, the first of the kings of Corinth. Hippotes had been originally the cause of the institution of the Carneia, but simply because he had been the cause of the death of Carnus; and as he had been banished for that act, and excluded from any immediate participation in the benefit of the return, it is very conceivable that it might not be considered proper that the Corinthian type of the common Carnean Ennead should be the same with that of the rest of the Peloponnese.

We must therefore draw out two Types of this Ennead, differing one lunar month asunder; but whether a month of 30, or one of 29 days, may be doubtful—though perhaps, out of deference to the standard of the first lunar month in the primitive Apis cycle, and to the primitive standard of the solar month, it may be more proper to assume it at 30 than at 29. We shall however exhibit it for both.

*Carnean Ennead. Epoch, B. C. 1096.*

	Type i.		Type ii.	
	Cycle.	Midnight.	Cycle.	Midnight.
B. C. 1096	i	Aug. 19	i	Sept. 18 or Sept. 17
95	ii	— 8	ii	— 7 — 6
94	*iii	July 28	*iii	Aug. 27 Aug. 26
*1093	iv	Aug. 15	iv	Sept. 14 Sept. 13
92	*v	— 4	*v	— 3 — 2
91	vi	— 23	vi	— 22 — 21
90	vii	— 12	vii	— 11 — 10
*1089	*viii	July 31	*viii	Aug. 30 Aug. 29

SECTION VII.—*On the Carnean Epoch in the Octaëteric Correction of the Spartans, B. C. 592.*

Preliminary to entering on this question, we may observe that, according to the original assumptions of the Pythian Ennead, its stated epoch in every year of the cycle was the Luna 7<sup>a</sup>. And though in the 126 years which had elapsed between the institution of that cycle and this of the Carnean Ennead, the numenæ of the Pythian Ennead had long ceased to represent the true Luna 7<sup>a</sup>, yet they might still have continued to represent it nominally. It would be easy to shew that if a given Julian term, August 18, B. C. 1222, represented the Luna septima, then, B. C. 1096, on the principles of the octaëteric cycle it must have been more nearly representing the Luna 15<sup>a</sup> or 16<sup>a</sup>. But, to place this out of question, we have only to refer to our General Lunar Calendar, Period x. x. 2, when Nisan 1 at midnight was falling on April 9 at midnight, B. C. 1096, and therefore Ab 1 on August 5, and Ab 15 on August 19. The proper Carnean epoch therefore at this time must have been the Lunar 15, not the Lunar 7.

It is also to be observed that the proper period even of the ἀποκατάστασις, in the octaëteric cycle, (the period of 160 years,) as we have often had occasion to explain, was not complete without a correction, amounting to a day; administered by raising the epoch of the cycle at the beginning of the 161st year (the first year of the xxist cycle) one number higher—from August 19 (in this instance) to August 20. We have often explained too that we have seen reason to conclude that this *kind* and *degree* of correction were both discovered

and applied among the Greeks long before the time of Solon. And as there were three periods of 160 years between B. C. 1096 and B. C. 592, the dates of which were B. C. 936, B. C. 776, and B. C. 616 respectively, it may be made a question whether the epoch of the cycle and the period, as assumed at first, B. C. 1096, remained the same in each of these other instances, or was corrected one day for each of these periods; in which case it must have risen, between B. C. 1096, the epoch of the first period, and B. C. 616, that of the fourth, from August 19 to August 22. And in answer to this question, the facts which we are about to lay before the reader allow of no alternative but that of supposing that, whatsoever might have been done in other instances of this kind, and in the administration of other octaëteric cycles, older than the correction of Solon, no change could have been made in the epoch of the Carnean Ennead, from the time of its institution to that of Solon itself. It must have continued nominally the same all along. And this being a possible contingency *per se*, whether it could be accounted for or not, we need not stop to conjecture the reasons to which it might be due; but may proceed at once to the proof of the fact.

The number of years from B. C. 1096 to B. C. 592 was 504; and this number of years was exactly equivalent to 63 octaëteric cycles. It follows that if the first Carnean Ennead had borne date Jan. 19 (instead of August 19) B. C. 1096, the 64th would have been bearing date Jan. 19 B. C. 592; and the Carnean epoch and cycle, and the epoch and cycle of the correction adopted at this time, B. C. 592, by the Spartans as well as by the Athenians, would have been in a condition to coalesce, and from that time forward to go on together, without the least difference between them. It was only an accidental distinction, under such circumstances, that the lxivth Carnean Ennead was bearing date August 19, and the first octaëteric cycle of the Spartan correction, on Jan. 19. Nothing could be more convenient in other respects, or better adapted *a priori*, for the transition of the cycle of the Carnean Ennead into the cycle of the calendar, than the state of the case just at this point of time.

The proper Carnean epoch then, transmitted down to this time from B. C. 1096, being assumed as still August 19, or

Sept. 18, it is easy to see that the first of these dates, August 19, reduced to its place in the Spartan correction, Cycle. i. 1, must have been falling on the seventh of the eighth month; and the second, Sept. 18, in like manner, on the seventh of the ninth. If therefore the stated epoch of the Carnean Ennead among the Spartans, in the first year of its proper cycle, was always August 19—then, from this time forward, and as transferred to their octaëteric correction, it would become the Luna septima\* of the eighth month. If it had always before been Sept. 18, from this time forward it would be the Luna septima of the ninth month. And this consequently is the question which we shall now have to consider; whether the stated date of the Carnea in the first Type of the octaëteric correction, in a given instance, is determinable to the Luna septima of the eighth month, or to the Luna septima of the ninth month.

It is necessary however, even for the consideration of this question, to remember, as we have often had occasion to explain, that if a lunar date, once determined to a particular day of the month, in any of these types, for particular reasons was bound to continue ever after true to the moon, we must expect to find it rising in terms of the solar month through successive cycles; and it is easy to conceive that there might be, and probably would be, such special reasons why the Carnean epoch in the Spartan, or any other, type of this octaëteris, having been once fixed to the Luna septima, (the day more especially sacred to Apollo in the lunar calendar of the time,) should be kept confined to the Luna septima. Accordingly it will be seen, that in almost every instance of the proper Carnean date in any of these types, to which we can appeal as matter of fact, it must have followed the moon, and

\* The original lunar character of the epoch, Aug. 19, B. C. 1096, having been the Luna 15<sup>a</sup>, we have

	B. C. 1096	Aug. 19	Luna 15	
- 160 × 3 =	- 480		- 3	
	B. C. 616	Aug. 19	Luna 12	
- 8 × 3 =	- 24 =		- 5	
	B. C. 592	Aug. 19	Luna 7	



gone on advancing from one solar term to another, retaining the same relation to the moon perpetually.

SECTION VIII.—*On the cases of the Carneia, older than B. C. 592.*

No case of the actual celebration of the Carneia before B. C. 592 is historically on record, but that which was distinguished by the addition of the musical contest to the rest of the ceremonial of the solemnity. The date of this having been B. C. 676, Olymp. xxvi. 1, just 100 years after the first Olymp. B. C. 776, the consequence of that coincidence would be that the cycle of these musical Carneia and the cycle of Olympiads would ever after be the same; and the Olympia and the musical Carneia would always be in course in one and the same year, the former first, the latter not long afterwards. Testimony confirms and illustrates this relation of the two cycles to each other, in a remarkable instance, as we shall see by and by; that of the Olympia and Carneia, both in course B. C. 480.

The stated date of these musical Carneia in the first year of the Carnean Ennead would be August 19, and in the fifth August 4. The year of their institution was one of this latter description; Cycle liii. 5, from the Epoch, August 19, B. C. 1096. We have not been able to discover anything in this year, which would be calculated to explain why it should have been selected as the epoch of the change now made in the Carnean solemnity; and we should be entirely of opinion that nothing was actually regarded in fixing upon it, except its numerical place in the years of the cycle, as the first in the second cycle of four years which entered the cycle of eight. It is observable however, that as this year, Cycle liii. 5 of the Carnean Ennead, corresponded to Cycle lxi. 3 of the Pythian, there would be just the same relation between the Julian epoch of the musical Carneia, now first instituted, August 4, and the original Pythian epoch in the third year, August 3, as between the original epoch of the Carneia, August 19, and the Pythian of the same time, August 18.

From the time too of this institution, the ancients begin to mention the names of the *Καρνειωῖκαι*, as they do those of

the Ὀλυμπιονῆται, and of the Πυθιονῆται; implying that a register of these quadriennial Carnea, and of the victors in them, must have begun to be kept from the same time forward. These Καρνειονῆται however are always to be understood of the victors in the contest of music, not in any other description of contest; the first of the number, as we have already observed, having been Terpander of Lesbus.

SECTION IX.—*On the cases of the Carnea, later than  
B. C. 592.*

i. B. C. 480.

The oldest instance of this kind is that of the Carnea, which were going on B. C. 480, and at that particular time in this year, when Xerxes was resuming his march, just after the battles of Thermopylæ and Artemisium<sup>n</sup>.

*Hellenic Octaëteric Correction.*

Type i, Cycle xv. 1, B. C. 480.

Carnean Epoch, 7th of the viiith month.  
7th of Metageitnion.

B. C. 480, xv. 1, Metageitnion	1	August	13 <sup>o</sup>
Precession 112 years <sup>p</sup>	— 21	—	21
Luna Prima. . . Metageitnion	22	September	3
Luna Septima	— 28	—	9

Carnean Feriæ, September 9–17.

Herodotus alluded to these Carnea, as approaching, but not yet arrived, when Leonidas was sent to the Isthmus; and to the Olympia as still nearer at that point of time. Leonidas was already at the Isthmus, when Xerxes was in Pieria, August 8–14<sup>r</sup>, and the Olympic feriæ this year fell August 15–20. They must therefore have been close at hand when he was sent to the Isthmus. The Carnea would be almost a month later. They might therefore have been alluded to as approaching at that time, but not as so near as the Olympia. In fact, we have the testimony of Herodotus<sup>s</sup>

<sup>n</sup> Vol. i. page 374.

<sup>p</sup> Vol. i. page 42.

<sup>o</sup> See vol. iii. Appendix, Table i.

<sup>r</sup> Part i. vol. i. 374.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. p. 376.

that they were actually going on when Xerxes resumed his march from Thermopylæ, on September 12—and that was the middle day this year of the Carnean feriæ themselves.

We regard this case then as a remarkable confirmation of the true Carnean epoch in this Spartan Type of the Octa-ëteric correction, the Luna Septima of the eighth month, the month corresponding to Metageitnion in the Attic calendar; and also of the fact of its following the moon, and rising consequently in terms of the solar month with successive cycles. Unless that had been the case, it could not possibly have been falling later than the Olympia, and later than the month of August, B. C. 480.

ii. B. C. 436.

The scene of the *Alkestis* of Euripides, as we saw on a former occasion<sup>t</sup>, was laid in Thessaly, and the chronological allusions which occurred in it, as we also saw, were adapted to the Thessalian calendar. Among these there was one to the Carnean month—which we quoted at that time for the illustration of the Thessalian calendar; and it is equally necessary to quote it again here, in illustration of the Carnean epoch of the Spartan calendar.

Πολλά σε μουσπόλοι  
 μέλψουσι καθ' ἐπτάτονόν τ' ὄρειαν  
 χέλυν ἔν τ' ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις  
 Σπάρτα κυκλὰς ἀνίκα Καρνείου περιπίσσειται ὦρα  
 μηνὸς, ἀειρομένας  
 παννύχου σελάνας,  
 κ', τ. λ.<sup>v</sup>

The Numeniæ of the Thessalian calendar, at the date of the *Alkestis*, were falling on the full moons of the natural month<sup>t</sup>, so that nothing could be more appropriate at this time than an allusion to the full of the moon along with the arrival of the Carnean month in the proper calendar of the *Alkestis*, the calendar of Thessaly. But the same coincidence of the Carnean epoch with the full of the moon, or with that period of the moon's revolution at least at which it shines more or less all night, would be equally true of its place in its own calendar. If the Carnean solemnity in the Spartan

<sup>t</sup> Vol. ii. page 458 sqq. cf. 573. vi.

<sup>v</sup> *Alkestis*, verse 445.

calendar ever since B. C. 592, always began on the Luna 7 and lasted till the Luna 15—it began at the first dichotomy, when the moon was already shining until midnight, and lasted till the full, when it would be shining all night, and must have been shining nearly the whole of the night for some time previously.

The date of the Alkestis was B. C. 438, Olymp. lxxxv. 3; and that not having been a year in which the musical Carnea would be in course, we must understand the allusion, in the preceding passage, to the celebration of the praises of Alkestis with songs and music at Sparta in the first year after the date of the play in which they could be: and that would be Olymp. lxxxvi. 1, B. C. 436.

*Hellenic Octaëteris, Type i.*

Cycle xx. 5.	..	..	Metageitnion 1	July 29	B. C. 436
Precession, 156 years	..		28	28	
Luna prima	..	..	Metageitnion 29	Aug. 26	
			6	6	
Luna septima, Carnean epoch,			Boëdromion 6	Sept. 1	
Carnean Feriæ, Boëdromion 6-14, Sept. 1-9.					

iii. B. C. 419.

It was shewn in our Dissertation on the Spartan Calendar <sup>x</sup>, that the Spartans discarded their Octaëteric correction, and adopted the Metonic, not at the end of its first period of 160 years, B. C. 432, but at the end of the first cycle of the second, B. C. 424; and that at the same time they changed the beginning of their year from January 19, the proper Julian epoch of the first month in the first year of the cycle, to October 11, that of the tenth. Before we can proceed to consider the two cases of the Carnea which are upon record, B. C. 419 and B. C. 418, when the Metonic correction was in use at Sparta, we must ascertain how far this change in the beginning of the year and in the nominal order of the months would affect the Carnean epoch.

It may be assumed that, though the calendar was not corrected at Sparta at the end of the first octaëteric Period,

<sup>x</sup> Vol. ii. 197.

B. C. 432, the Carnean epoch would be rectified and reduced to its first principles, by being set back to August 19—the true lunar and solar seventh of the eighth month at that time, as much as B. C. 592. Consequently that from B. C. 432 to B. C. 424 everything would go on agreeably to the old rule of the solemnity; and this very year, B. C. 424 itself, before the correction of the calendar could have taken effect, the Carneæ must have been celebrated from the 7th to the 15th of the eighth month, August 19–27, or at the latest, August 20–28, as usual.

But this being the year in which these changes were made, and the head of the calendar was transferred from January 19 to October 11—the tenth month from this time forward became the first; and consequently the ninth became the twelfth, and the eighth became the eleventh. If the eighth month therefore was the Carnean month in the octaëteric correction, the eleventh must have been so in the Metonic; and if the Carnean feriæ in the former were from the 7th to the 15th of the eighth month, they must have been from the 7th to the 15th of the eleventh in the latter.

We shall now proceed to consider how far this conclusion is borne out by the two cases of the Carneæ, extant in Thucydides, one in the 13th year of the war  $\gamma$ , B. C. 419, the other in the 14th  $\zeta$ , B. C. 418.

*Metonic Calendar of Sparta.* Period i. 5. Cycle i. 5.<sup>a</sup>

Month.	Exempt.	B. C.	Month.	Exempt.	B. C.
i Sept.	27	420	viii April	22	21
ii Oct.	27	12	ix May	21	419
iii Nov.	25		x June	20	24
iv Dec.	25	15	xi A July	19	Kαρνεῖος A
v Jan.	23	419	xii = xi B	Aug. 18	27 Καρνεῖος B
vi Feb.	22	18	xii Sept.	16	
vii March	23				

i. Oct. 16. Ex. 30. B. C. 419.

The war between the Argives and the Epidaurians broke out in the summer of this year<sup>b</sup>; and when the Lacedæmonians were preparing to undertake a secret expedition, the border-sacrifices not being favourable, it was abandoned for

<sup>v</sup> v. 51–54. cf. 55, 56.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. 75. cf. 57. 81.

<sup>a</sup> See vol. iii. Appendix, Table x.

<sup>b</sup> v. 52–53. cf. 51.

that time. The context would date this event somewhere about the middle of Thucydides' chronological summer, i. e. the Julian June or July: but it appears from his own testimony it happened some time in the month which preceded that in which the Carnea were expected to be celebrated: Ἐξεστράτευσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους... ὡς δ' αὐτοῖς τὰ διαβατήρια θυομένοις οὐ προὐχώρει, αὐτοί τε ἀπήλθον ἐπ' οἶκον, καὶ τοῖς ξυμμάχοις παρήγγειλαν μετὰ τὸν μέλλοντα (sc. μῆνα), Καρνείος δ' ἦν μὴν ἱερομηνία Δωριεῦσιν, παρασκευάζεσθαι ὡς στρατευσομένοις<sup>c</sup>. It is evident therefore that they intended to have made this expedition in the month before the Carnean; that is, according to the above scheme, in the 11th month, there marked Καρνείος A; the limits of which were July 19, and August 18.

From this testimony then it is an obvious inference that the 12th month this year must have been the regular Carnean month, not only in the Spartan calendar of this time, but in that of their allies, Dorians and Peloponnesians like themselves: and this must be decisive that each of these Doric communities had a Carnean month, the site of which in its proper calendar did not differ materially from that of the same month in the Spartan. It may at least be inferred from it, that the limits of the proper Carnean month in the Spartan calendar at this time being August 18 and September 16, they must have expected the Carnea to be over among their allies everywhere, by the latest of these Julian terms. We have explained however<sup>d</sup>, that there might have been, and probably were, from the first, two types of the Carnean Ennead, one of them a month later than the other, and attached to Sept. 18 instead of Aug. 19; and we observed at the same time that this latter type in particular appeared to have been adopted at Corinth. It is a curious coincidence that the Corinthians at this time were at war with the Lacedemonians, and therefore could not have been included among those whose Carnean holidays they expected to be over by September 16.

The lunar calendar of the allies of the Lacedemonians throughout the Peloponnese at this time may very probably be assumed as that of the third Type of the Hellenic Octa-

<sup>c</sup> V. 54.

<sup>d</sup> Supra, page 404 sqq.

ëteris in general, Jan. 7, B. C. 542. This fact is certain of the Argive calendar, as we hope to see hereafter; and, from what Thucydides relates of the conduct of the Argives on this occasion, it may be shewn that, as they too had a proper Carnean month at this time, and kept the Carnea according to a rule of their own, so the Carnean holidays in their instance also, on the present occasion, fell critically within the limits assigned in our scheme to the Carnean month in the Spartan calendar. For he proceeds to observe, Ἄργεῖοι δ' ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν (the Lacedemonians), τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ Καρνείου μηνὸς ἐξελθόντες τετράδι φθίνοντος, καὶ ἄγοντες τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην πάντα τὸν χρόνον, ἐσέβαλον ἐς τὴν Ἐπιδαυρίαν, καὶ ἐδήουν. Ἐπιδαυριοὶ δὲ τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἐπεκαλοῦντο ὧν τινες οἱ μὲν τὸν μῆνα προῦφασίσαντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐς μεθορίαν τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας ἐλθόντες ἡσύχαζον<sup>e</sup>.

We cannot agree with such of the learned as have construed these words, ἄγοντες τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην πάντα τὸν χρόνον, to mean, “Marching that day,” and nothing more. They might have borne that construction, had they stood simply ἄγοντες τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην—but with the addition of πάντα τὸν χρόνον such a construction is little better than absurd. The truth is that, among the senses of ἄγειν in Greek, one of the commonest, especially with ἐορτῆν, or any such term, is that of keeping, or observing. Thus, in the Scholiast on the Plutus, on Ἄγομεν εἰς<sup>f</sup>—ἄγειν τὸ νομίζειν καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι ὡς παρὰ Συνεσίφ<sup>g</sup>. Ἡμέρα μὲν οὖν ἦν ἡντινα ἄγουσιν Ἰουδαῖοι παρασκευῆν (corrigè ἀπραξίαν)—i. e. it was the Sabbath-day, which, as everybody knew, the Jews passed, that is, kept and observed, as holy. There is nothing peculiar in the use of ἄγειν here in Thucydides, except that instead of ἄγοντες τὴν ἐορτῆν, he has ἄγοντες τὴν ἡμέραν<sup>h</sup>—one day of the feast in particular instead of the whole of it in general. And yet that ἄγοντες so constructed must still have had the sense of ἐορτάζοντες, might always have been inferred from the comment of the Scholiast: Ἐνιοὶ δὲ, ἐορτάζοντες διὰ παντὸς τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην.

But in reality the proper inference from this mode of speaking, in reference to what the Argives were doing on this occasion, is that the day of this expedition, defined and

<sup>e</sup> v. 54.<sup>f</sup> Vers. 621. cf. ad 285 also.<sup>g</sup> Epp. iv. 161 D.<sup>h</sup> Cf. v. 75. of the next year.

specified under the style of the *τετράς φθίνοντος* (the 27th) of the month before the Carnean month in the Spartan calendar, was the proper beginning of the Carnean holidays in the Argive calendar itself. The meaning of Thucydides is, that the Argives both set out upon the expedition on this day, as if it was not the first of the Carnean *feriæ*, and kept it nevertheless as if it was: and the only qualification which his words require under such circumstances is, that those of the Argives who were thus treating it as a common day, and those who were keeping it as the first of the Carnean *feriæ*, were not the same; the former were the Argives who were setting out on this expedition, the latter were such as were staying at home. And though at first sight it may look like a great anomaly, that the same day should be treated both as if it was not an holy-day, and as if it was, there was doubtless some show of reason for the distinction at the time, into which it may be worth while to inquire.

In the first place, the Argive calendar being a clear case of one of those which are to be reduced to the third type of the Hellenic octaëteris in general, we must begin with fixing the proper Carnean epoch in terms of this type; assuming merely that the observance of the solemnity was transferred from its proper cycle previously, to that of this type, B. C. 542. Now B. C. 542 was 554 years later than B. C. 1096; i. e. 69 cycles of eight years, and two more of the 70th. The epoch of this correction therefore, Cycle i. 1, corresponded to Cycle lxx. 3, of the proper Carnean ennead of Type i. But we have already explained<sup>i</sup>, with respect to the proper Julian epoch of this first type, that it appears to have had two; one taken from the second day of the current year of the Pythian ennead, and from the first day of the current equable month, August 19; the other taken directly from the proper Pythian date the same year, August 18; and that while the former was adopted at Sparta, the latter was fixed upon by the Argives. The proper Julian epoch of Cycle lxx. 3, deduced from the epoch of August 19, B. C. 1096, would have been July 28; that of the same year of the same cycle, derived from August 18, would be one day earlier, July 27.

<sup>i</sup> *Supra*, 405, 406.



And this being assumed to have been the proper Carnean epoch in the Argive ennead, Cycle lxx. 3, July 27, not July 28; it would be found to correspond to the 25th of the seventh month in the third type of the Octaëteric correction, B. C. 542. For the stated date of the first of the viith month, Cycle i. 1 of that type, being July 3<sup>k</sup>, that of the 25th in the same must have been July 27. And this being the case, if the Carneia were transferred by the Argives at that time from their own ennead to this cycle, and were celebrated at Argos for the same length of time as at Sparta, it is manifest that from this time forward the Carnean ferie at Argos would fall out partly in the seventh month, and partly in the eighth, of their proper lunar calendar; but the greater proportion of them in the latter: to which therefore the name of Carneus would be given more probably than to the former.

This therefore being supposed to have been the original Carnean epoch in the Argive correction of Type iii, the 25th Luna of the seventh month, Cycle i. 1, July 27, B. C. 542; then, if this too followed the moon through successive cycles of the Octaëteric period in its proper type, as the Spartan one is seen to have done, B. C. 419, it would be found falling critically, as Thucydides represents it to have been, viz. on the 27th of the month before the Carnean one in the Spartan calendar of the time being. In this third type, B. C. 419 answered to Cycle xvi. 4, the 124th year of the period, when the precession amounted to 22 days complete<sup>l</sup>.

*Octaëteric Correction.*

Type iii. Cycle xvi. 4.

Luna Prima of the seventh month,	..	June 29	B. C. 419
Precession, 124 years	..	..	22
True Luna Prima	..	July 21	
			24
True Luna xxv. (Carnean epoch)	..	Aug. 14	

Now this date, August 14, reduced to the Spartan calendar proposed supra, falls on the 27th of the month there marked *Καρνείος Α*, the style of which in the Greek idiom was the *τερὰς φθίνοντος*. And this, every one must allow, is a very

<sup>k</sup> Vol. iii. Appendix, Table iii.

<sup>l</sup> Vol. i. Table, p. 42.

critical coincidence. The language of Thucydides, in speaking of this day, rightly construed, implied that the Argives were treating it, at one and the same time, both as an *ἱερομηνία*, and as not; as an *ἱερομηνία*, and the Carnean *ἱερομηνία*, at home, as not an *ἱερομηνία* for the particular purpose of this inroad into the country of the Epidaurians abroad. And the reason of this distinction is probably now explained; viz. that though the Carnean epoch in the Argive calendar might be falling on this day, in the Epidaurian calendar it might be falling a day later; and they had it in their power to say that they were guilty of no breach of the Carnean hieromenia, so far as the Epidaurians were concerned, by invading their territory on the 27th of this month, the day before that hieromenia in *their* calendar. The Epidaurian frontier lay within a day's march of Argos; and it does not appear that this incursion lasted more than one day. The allies of the Epidaurians too were within a day's march of their borders, and when they were summoned to their aid, on this occasion, some of them are said to have excused themselves on account of the month—that is, the Carnean holidays—as they might very well do, if those would set in the very next day; others to have marched out as far as the Epidaurian frontier, but no further: and that was as much, as even those who lay within less than a day's march of the Epidaurian territory could be expected to do, before the arrival of the Carnean holidays; especially as reckoned according to the common rule, from sunset or evening before the first of them according to the Julian rule, August 15.

It is observable however that even after the Carnea should be over this year, the Spartans expected there would still be time for an expedition, on their part and that of their allies, of which they gave them notice beforehand: and that could not fail to be the case, if their own Carnea this year would be over by Sept. 2, and those of such of their allies whose rule might have agreed with the Argive rule more than their own, by August 23 at the latest, a month and upwards before the close of Thucydides' summer, and the arrival of his winter, with the autumnal equinox.

Another very observable circumstance of the relation of these several dates to each other this year is, that B. C. 420—

419, being the fifth year of the first Metonic cycle in the Spartan calendar, the *τετρὰς φθίνοντος* was the last exemptile day in that year of the cycle, and its proper seat in the order of such days was the 27th of the xiith month, as it is exhibited in the scheme<sup>m</sup>. When Thucydides therefore spoke of the *τετρὰς φθίνοντος* of the month before the Carnean month this year, he could not possibly have meant the 27th of the xiith month, simply because there was no such day in the calendar that year. He must therefore have meant the 27th of the xith, which was a full month, and had all its days under their proper styles respectively. For the same reason neither could the Carnean epoch in the Argive calendar this year have fallen on the 27th of the xiith month in the Spartan calendar the same year, (which would have been Sept. 12,) but solely on the 27th of the xith, August 14. And these are very critical distinctions, and such as nothing could have produced but the truth itself.

It is also to be observed that the fifth year of the Metonic cycle being intercalary by rule, there must have been an intercalation B. C. 420—419, in the Spartan calendar; the seat of which in their Metonic, as much as in their old Octa-ëteric, correction, we have already seen<sup>n</sup>, would be the end of the year; and as it might have been supposed *a priori*, after the xiith month. Here then, the fact which we have just been considering, (the date of the Carneia this year, as it is to be collected from contemporary testimony,) comes in to make a discovery which perhaps never could have been made without it; viz. that the intercalary month in the Metonic correction of the Spartans must have been a second *Καρνεῖος*, and that in those years which had both the *Καρνεῖος* A and the *Καρνεῖος* B, the proper Carnean month was the latter, not the former. And yet it will follow even from this distinction in the intercalary years, that the proper Carnean month in the common years of the cycle must have been the xith month; the same which in the intercalary years assumed the name of *Καρνεῖος* A: the same month which in the Metonic correction, when the head of the calendar was transferred from the first month to the tenth, and from January 19 to

<sup>m</sup> Page 413.<sup>n</sup> See vol. ii. 197. 208.

October 11, succeeded to the place of the eighth month in the Octaëteric correction, the proper Carnean month in that.

iv. B. C. 418.

*Metonic Calendar at Sparta.*

Period i. 6, Cycle i. 6.

B. C. 419-418.

Month.	Ex.	B. C.	Month.	Ex.	B. C.
i Oct. 16	30	419	vii April 11		418
ii Nov. 14			viii May 11	9	
iii Dec. 14			ix June 9		
iv Jan. 13	3	418	x July 9	12	
v Feb. 11			xi Aug. 7		Καρνεῖος.
vi Mar. 13	6		xii Sept. 6	15	

Carnean Feriæ, August 13-21.

This was the fourteenth year of the war <sup>o</sup>. The first of its events was the first expedition of the Lacedæmonians against the Argives <sup>p</sup>, followed by the four months' truce <sup>q</sup>; and then the second, followed by the battle of Mantinea <sup>r</sup>. It is clear from the context that the second expedition could not have been much later than the first; and certainly could not have been delayed until the expiration of the truce—from the obligation of which the Lacedæmonians would naturally consider themselves excused by the conduct of the Argives and their allies.

Now, after the battle, the Lacedæmonians returned home, and dismissed their allies, this year just for the same reason as the year before, viz. because the Carnea were at hand: Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀναχωρήσαντες καὶ τοὺς ξυμμαχικοὺς ἀφέντες (Κάρνεια γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐτύγχανεν ὄντα) τὴν ἑορτὴν ἦγον <sup>s</sup>. The Carnea having been kept the year before, August 24 to September 1, would be in course this year August 13-21, from the 7th to the 15th of the xith month. Everything therefore this year would be consistent with the state of the case in the same respects the year before.

<sup>o</sup> v. 56, 57.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. 57-59.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. 60.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. 61-74.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. 75.

We may infer too that if the four months' truce had not expired before August 7, the first of the Carnean month this year, it could not have been concluded earlier than the first of the seventh month, April 11, and very probably was even a month or two later; which would be more agreeable to the time actually assigned it by Thucydides<sup>t</sup>, *θέρους μεσοῦντος*—June or July. It is evident also that if the Carnean feria this year were Aug. 13–21, the Carnean holidays at Sparta would be over long before the equinox: and that if there would be time the same year to take the field again, after the equinox, much more would there be after the Carnean hieromenia, not only at Sparta, but every where among their allies also; as Thucydides tells us there was<sup>u</sup>: Τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου χειμῶνος ἀρχομένου εὐθὺς οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐπειδὴ τὰ Κάρνεια ἤγαγον, ἐξέστράτευσαν κ', τ. λ.

He tells us also that this year likewise the Argives made an incursion into the Epidaurian territory, during the Carnean holidays at Sparta: Ἔως οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι Κάρνεια ἤγον<sup>v</sup>: but he does not say this was during their own Carnean holidays, as it was the year before. Their own Carneia this year would begin August 3, and last until August 11 inclusive—and this expedition was probably undertaken on August 12, the day after their own were over, and the day before the Spartan began; and was still continuing August 13—the first of the Carnean holidays at Sparta, and perhaps some days after also.

v. Rule of the Carneia in the Syracusan Calendar; and date of the Syracusan Carneia, B. C. 413.

It has been seen<sup>x</sup> that Carneus was the name of the ninth month in the Syracusan calendar; and we may infer from this fact that the Carneia at Syracuse were celebrated in this ninth month. We have seen too that B. C. 413 the limits of this month were August 19 and September 17. We may presume then that the Carneia this year were celebrated at Syracuse, between these dates. And the knowledge of this fact may enable us to discover their rule in the calendar of

<sup>t</sup> v. 57.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. 76.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. 75.

<sup>x</sup> Vol. ii. page 386 sqq. 390.

Syracuse, as one among the other calendars reducible to the Third Type of the Hellenic Octaëteris in general.

We have already explained <sup>y</sup> that there were probably from the first two Types of the Carnean Ennead, one which bore date August 19, and another which bore date Sept. 18, B. C. 1096. B. C. 542 corresponded to Cycle lxx. 3 in each of these alike; but in the former the proper Carnean epoch for the time, July 28, would correspond to the 26th of the seventh month, Cycle i. 1, of the Third Type of the Octaëteris in question; and in the latter, the proper epoch, August 27, would correspond to the 27th of the eighth <sup>z</sup>. Let us then assume first of all, that the Carnean epoch as transferred to the Syracusan correction, Cycle i. 1, was fixed to the Luna 26 of the seventh month; and that the epoch itself, attached to the Luna 26 at first, was intended to follow it ever after, as in the Spartan correction of Type i, and in the Argive of Type iii. We have then, Hellenic Octaëteris, Type iii,

Cycle xvii. 2, 26th of viiith month, July 16, B. C. 413.

Precession, 129 years . . . . . 24

True Luna 26 . . . . . August 9.

And this being ten days earlier than the earliest date of the Carnea in the Syracusan calendar, which would be admissible that year, viz. August 19, it is clear that the Carnean epoch in the Syracusan calendar from B. C. 542 downwards could not have been the Luna 26th of the seventh month.

Let us suppose then it was the Luna 27 of the eighth month. We have as before, Hellenic Octaëteris, Type iii,

Cycle xvii. 2, Luna 27th of the viiith month, August 15, B. C. 413.

Precession . . . . . 24

True Luna 27th . . . . . September 8.

And this would certainly fall within the limits of the Carnean month at Syracuse, August 19 and Sept. 17 the same year: and if the Carnean feriae were nine in number here, as at Sparta, they would have taken up the nine last days of this month itself, Sept. 8-16. It happens however that these last nine

<sup>y</sup> Supra, 404.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. supra, 407. and vol. iii. Appendix, Table iii.

days of the month Carneus, B. C. 413, at Syracuse, came within that period of the same month, of every day of which Thucydides has given an account; and if any of them had coincided with the Carnean holidays he could scarcely have failed to notice that coincidence. The very day of the capture of Nikias, Carneus 27, Sept. 14, must have been the seventh of the Carnean feriæ.

We may therefore very probably conclude that there was something peculiar in the Carnean rule of the Syracusan calendar, compared with what it was in other Doric calendars of the same time, or before it; and we should be of opinion that this peculiarity consisted in two things—i. In its having borrowed the Carnean epoch, for the calendar of B. C. 542, from the second type of the Carnean Eumead, not from the first; ii. In its having attached this epoch to a fixed solar, and a nominal lunar, date in its proper cycle, which did not follow the moon, but remained the same in terms perpetually. Let us then see whether these suppositions will explain the date of the Syracusan Carneæ, B. C. 413.

The proper Carnean feriæ, Cycle lxx. 3, Type ii. being August 27—Sept. 4, B. C. 542, it is observable that they would enter at that time partly into the eighth, and partly into the ninth, month of Cycle i. 1. of the third type of the Hellenic octaëteris in general; the first four would be the four last days of the eighth month, and the last five would be the first five of the ninth. The Syracusans therefore would have to decide whether they should give the name of Carneus to the eighth month, or to the ninth; and they might determine in favour of the latter, because the greater part of the Carnean feriæ, B. C. 542, were falling in that, not in the other. The stated date however of the Carnean feriæ in the calendar, from this time forward, being always from the 27th of the eighth month to the 5th of the ninth inclusive, the fifth of this ninth month, B. C. 413, was August 23. And August 23 was four days earlier than that time in the decursus of this month, from which we have in Thucydides a circumstantial account of almost every day in it to the end. For his account begins on the 9th of Carneus, (Aug. 27) and extends down to the 27th, (Sept. 14) at least. There could

be no allusion in it therefore to the Carnean feriæ, because they must have been over before it began.

This is the only explanation of the Syracusan rule of the Carnea which we have to propose. The reader will judge of it for himself. We will observe further, that whatsoever was the rule of this kind at Syracuse, it was probably the same at Corinth, though we have no proof to produce that it actually was.

vi. On the Rule of the Carnea in the Calendar of Cyrene.

We know from the testimony of Pindar and Callimachus<sup>a</sup> that the Carnean rule at Cyrene was derived from the Spartan; and it confirms this, that the proper Carnean epoch in the calendar of Cyrene appears to have been the Luna septima, as much as in the Spartan<sup>b</sup>.

The only case however of the actual celebration of the Carnea at Cyrene, which has come down to posterity, is that of the year of the birth of Carneades<sup>c</sup>, which we considered in the first part of the present work. We assumed at that time that the date of the transition of the calendar of Cyrene into the Macedonian was B. C. 304; and if the Carnea was one of the principal solemnities of the Cyrenian calendar, it might contribute to the choice of that date for the purpose, that B. C. 304 stood at the distance of an even number of cycles of eight years, from B. C. 1096, the proper Carnean epoch; viz. 99 exactly.

In the Spartan calendar, this year corresponded to Period ii. 44. *exeunte*, in which the Carnean month would bear date August 7, and the Carnean feriæ August 13–21\*.

vii. Cycle of the Carnean Ennead, B. C. 240.

It has been seen<sup>d</sup> that B. C. 240 was known at Sparta to have coincided with the end of one regular cycle of the Car-

\* See the scheme, supra, p. 420, adapted to Period i. 6. Cycle i. 6. and equally so for Period ii. 44. Cycle vii. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Vol. iii. 570. Calendar of Cyrene.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 577. 583.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 565.

<sup>d</sup> Supra, 393.



nean Ennead, or the beginning of another; and it is easy to shew that such must have been the case.

The interval from B. C. 1096 to B. C. 240 was 856 years, and these were = 107 cycles of eight years exactly. By the original rule of the Carneia therefore, the 107th cycle would have expired on August 18, and the 108th have begun on August 19, B. C. 240. The actual Carnean date even in the calendar of the time being, Period iii. 32 *exunte*, was only six days later, August 25, as the following scheme will shew.

*Metonic Calendar of Sparta, Period iii. 32. Cycle ii. 13.*

Month.	Ex.	B. C.	Month.	Ex.	B. C.
i Sept.	28	241	vii March	24	240
ii Oct.	28	3	viii April	23	12
iii Nov.	26		ix May	22	
iv Dec.	26	6	x June	21	15
v Jan.	24	240	xi A July	20	
vi Feb.	23	9	xi B Aug.	19	18
			xii Sept.	17.	

Carneus B Aug. 19 Ex. 18.  
 — B 7-15 25-Sept. 2.  
 Carnean Feriæ, B. C. 240.

This must consequently have been the cycle, of the expiration of which the ephor Lysander took advantage to carry into effect his scheme for getting rid of the king Leonidas. And August 18, the last day of this cycle, as coinciding that year with the Luna 30, on which there could be no moon, was probably the very day on which he revived the old rule of the observation de cœlo, necessary for his purpose\*.

\* If it should be considered improbable that so accurate a reckoning of the Carnean cycle from its proper epoch, B. C. 1096, down to the time of this incident in the reign of Agis and Leonidas, could have been kept up at Sparta, it may be observed that there is no more difficulty in supposing this to have been the case with the Carnean Ennead at Sparta, than with the octaëteris of Minos, which must have been reckoned uninterruptedly in Crete from B. C. 1260 to B. C. 468, as we saw supra, Diss. iii. vol. iv. p. 548; or with the Panathenaic Ennead of Theseus, which must have been similarly reckoned at Athens, from B. C. 1206 to B. C. 566, at least, or as we shall see, we hope, hereafter, with the Pythian Ennead, which must

have been reckoned uninterruptedly at Delphi from B. C. 1222 to B. C. 582.

It is very observable that, according to Plutarch, *supra*, the sign which was supposed to intimate the displeasure of the gods with the kings, was *shooting stars*. What the ephors were accustomed to watch for, once in these eight years, was the phenomenon of shooting stars, in a clear sky, by night. Now in this fact we possess a singular confirmation of our assumption, that the cycle, which regulated this observation every eight years, was the Carnean Ennead, and the epoch of this Ennead was what we have assumed, August 19.

The last day of any one of these cycles would be August 18, if the first was August 19; and the stated time of these observations of the stars, if made strictly between two cycles, would be August 18, reckoned according to the Greek rule of the noctidiurnal cycle, from sunset, August 17. We may assume therefore that its stated date, according to the Julian reckoning, was the night of August 17.

Now it is well known to astronomers and meteorologists that there are two times in the year at present, at which the phenomenon of falling stars, or meteors, is of very common, and almost stated, and regular, occurrence, once in the month of August, and again in the month of November; but especially in the month of August, when it can be reckoned upon with much more certainty than in the month of November. The common time of the appearance of this phenomenon in the month of August, at present, is the ninth, the tenth, and the eleventh, of that month; of which Sir John Herschell, in his *Outlines of Astronomy* (§ 900), observes, that in the night of each of these, the 9th, the 10th, and the 11th of August, "numerous large and bright shooting stars with trains are always sure to be seen."

Now the 9th of August, new style, at present, is the 48th day from the summer solstice, assumed to be June 22, new style; and as the appearance of these phenomena, at stated times in the year, depends on the place of the earth at the time, in its revolution about the sun, we may assume that, if this phenomenon recurs at present with something like regularity 48 days after the summer solstice, it did the same in former times. Consequently, that meteors, such as are seen at present, on the night of the 9th, or 10th, or 11th of August, were always liable to be seen at the corresponding points of the earth's revolution about the sun in former times.

The custom in question, at Sparta, could not have been older than the institution of the ephorship, the ephors being the persons who thus sate in judgment upon the kings. And though the date of the institution of the ephorship is a doubtful point, the most probable conclusion is that it came into being in the reign of Theopompus, the king who was contemporary with the first Messenian war, B. C. 743 to 723. Let us assume that the ephorship, and with it this rule of state, both came into being about B. C. 744, in the first year of Cycle v. of the third Carnean period. The mean vernal equinox of that time was falling March 30, and the true summer solstice July 1. Reckon on 47 days from July 1, and you come to August 17. At this period therefore in the history of the world, such phenomena as

those of meteors and shooting stars were to be looked for with as much certainty and as much regularity, on or about August 17 or 18, as they are now, on or about August 9 or 10.

There can be little question that the origin of this rule of state at Sparta is ultimately to be traced to the observation of this particular phenomenon, just at the end of one Carnean Ennead, and the beginning of another; though why that was construed in a manner so ominous for the kings, and when such a construction began to be put upon it, is another question. All that we are concerned with is the fact itself, and its date; that the phenomenon, if visible at all at this time, must have been so on or about the 17th or 18th of August, and if watched for once in eight years, must have been so between two Carnean Enneads.

## DISSERTATION X.

### *On the Hyakinthian or Amyclæan Ennead.*

#### CHAPTER I.

##### SECTION I.—*On the rule of the Hyakinthia in the Spartan Calendar, from B. C. 592 downwards.*

The name of Hyakinthia was given to one of the best known and most illustrious of the solemnities observed in the ancient Sparta; and we have seen reason to conclude that this too had an Ennead, or octaëteric cycle, peculiar to itself, as old as its own institution, the proper name of which might be assumed either as that of the Hyakinthian, or as that of the Amyclæan, indifferently. But in order to the discovery of the epoch of this more ancient cycle, and the rule of the Hyakinthia therein from the first, we must begin with ascertaining, if possible, their rule in the octaëteric correction of later date; i. e. from B. C. 592 downwards.

First then, the Hyakinthia, according to their proper rule in this cycle of later date, (i. e. in the Spartan calendar, strictly so called,) appear to have been an annual observance. We may infer this fact, i. from the testimony of Thucydides, where he was giving an account of the peace concluded between the Lacedæmonians and the Athenians, in the eleventh year of the war, B. C. 421, not long after Elaphebolion 25<sup>a</sup>, that year<sup>b</sup>: Ὁμοῦνται δὲ ταῦτα οἵπερ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας σπονδὰς ὤμνουν ἐκατέρων. ἀναγεῦσθαι δὲ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Λακεδαιμονίους μὲν ἰόντας ἐς Ἀθήνας πρὸς τὰ Διονύσια, Ἀθηναίους δὲ ἰόντας ἐς Λακεδαίμονα πρὸς τὰ Ἰακίνθια. στήλην δὲ ἐκατέρους στήσαι, τῆν'

<sup>a</sup> v. 19, 20, 24.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. 23.

μὲν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι παρ' Ἀπόλλωνι ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ, τὴν δὲ ἐν Ἀθῆναις ἐν πόλει παρ' Ἀθηνᾶ.

It was hereby stipulated that both parties should renew the obligations of the covenant every year, the Lacedæmonians in Athens at the Dionysia, the Athenians in Sparta at the Hyakinthia. The Hyakinthia consequently must have been annual as much as the Dionysia\*: and from the order in which both these solemnities are specified by name, it might probably be inferred that the Dionysia came round at Athens earlier in the year than the Hyakinthia at Sparta; and therefore if the former were a feast of the spring, the latter were probably one of the summer.

ii. From the testimony of Ovid<sup>c</sup>:

Nec genuisse pudet Sparten Hyakinthon, honosque  
Durat in hoc ævi, celebrandaque more priorum  
Annua prælata redeunt Hyakinthia pompa.

For this too proves that even in his time they were still celebrated, according to their ancient rule, and still every year. They must therefore have been annual from the first.

Secondly, the stated month of the Hyakinthia in the Spartan calendar appears to have been that the name of which was Ἐκατομβεύς—consequently the viith<sup>d</sup>—answering in the Attic calendar to Ἐκατομβαιῶν. Ἐκατομβεύς μὴν παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἐν ᾧ τὰ Ἰακίνθια<sup>e</sup>: from which gloss, it seems

\* The testimony of Thucydides in this respect is illustrated and confirmed by that of Xenophon in two consecutive years also. First, B. C. 393, in his account of the expedition of Agesilaus against Corinth, when he took the Lechæum<sup>1</sup>, returning directly after to Sparta, and celebrating the Hyakinthia, consequently those of B. C. 393. Secondly, in his account of the next year, B. C. 392, the expedition against the Piræus at Corinth, followed by the loss of the Mora<sup>2</sup>. This Mora was intercepted and cut off by Iphicrates, as it was returning from escorting the Amyclæans in the army of Agesilaus, part of the way, when going home to be ready for the Hyakinthia at Sparta, then at hand; consequently those of B. C. 392. We shall have occasion to consider the circumstances of this celebration hereafter; in order to the illustration of the rule of the Isthmian games.

<sup>1</sup> Agesilaus, ii. § 17. cf. Hellenica, iv. iv. 1. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Agesilaus, ii. § 18, 19: Hellenica, iv. v. 1-18.

<sup>c</sup> Metam. x. 217.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. ii. 202. Spartan Calendar.

<sup>e</sup> Hesychius.

to be a just inference, not only that the Spartan Hecatombeus was the regular month of the Spartan Hyakinthia, but also that it was remarkable for nothing so much as this Hyakinthian solemnity. It is necessarily implied at least by this relation of the Hyakinthia to the month Hecatombeus, that the stated season of this month in the natural year must have been that of the Hyakinthia also; and, if the proper site of this month was midsummer, the same must have been the case with that of the Hyakinthia. It was impossible that the Hyakinthia could have been of stated occurrence in the Spartan Hecatombeus, and yet have fallen out in the spring, in any month of that calendar which would have corresponded to Thargelion in the Attic, or April or May in the Julian: though this opinion has been entertained concerning them\*.

Thirdly, the Hyakinthia appear to have been celebrated for three days; as we learn from the testimony of a Lacede-

\* Thucydides mentions the Hyakinthia again<sup>1</sup>, in his account of the overtures made to the Lacedæmonians by the Argives, in the xiith year of the war, *ineunte*, "Ἄμα δὲ τῷ ἡρι εὐθὺς τοῦ ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους<sup>2</sup>. The proposed treaty was put off by the former for a time: and the Argives were told to go home, and come again, 'Ἐς τὰ Ἱακίνθια τοὺς ὄρκους ποιησομένους<sup>3</sup>. And from this and the preceding laid together, Dodwell inferred that the Hyakinthia were celebrated in Thargelion.

It follows certainly from these testimonies that they were later this year than the beginning of Thucydides' chronological summer; viz. the vernal equinox. And so they would be, if they were celebrated in July. But as to their real time that year, according to Thucydides, no judgment could be formed about it without taking into consideration every thing which he relates, beginning at the time when these Argive ambassadors were still at Sparta<sup>4</sup>, down to the conclusion of the treaty of alliance between the Athenians, Argives, Mantineans, and Eleans<sup>5</sup>; all which, it is evident, was regular and consecutive, beginning while these Argive deputies were still at Sparta<sup>6</sup>, and over before the time appointed for their coming again, i. e. the Hyakinthia.

It may be collected too<sup>7</sup>, that the above treaty of alliance was probably concluded 30 days before the Olympia, which were in course this year<sup>8</sup>. The Olympic feriæ, B. C. 420, (Olymp. xc,) were July 13-18. On this principle, all the particulars alluded to in Thucydides<sup>9</sup> had come to pass between the spring of his *θέρος* and July 13.

<sup>1</sup> v. 41.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 40.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 41.<sup>4</sup> v. 42.<sup>5</sup> v. 42-48.<sup>6</sup> v. 42. 44.<sup>7</sup> v. 47.<sup>8</sup> v. 49 sqq.<sup>9</sup> v. 40-48.

monian historian, Polycrates, quoted by Athenæus<sup>t</sup>: Πολυκράτης ἐν τοῖς Λακωνικοῖς ἱστορεῖ ὅτι τὴν μὲν τῶν Ὑακινθίων θυσίαν οἱ Λάκωνες ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας συντελοῦσι κ', τ. λ.

These three particulars of the rule of the ancient Hyakinthia are all to which express testimony is on record at present. Each of them is to be understood of the rule *de facto* in the Spartan calendar, from B. C. 592 downwards. And they may be summed up in the three following propositions. i. That the Hyakinthia were an annual observance. ii. That they were celebrated every year in the month Hecatombeus. iii. That they lasted three days; that is, the Hyakinthian feriae, or holidays, were three in number. But we do not yet know what these three days were; nor why the ceremony should have been attached to those three days in particular. And though we know of no positive testimony to this point, which would determine it at once; yet much light will be thrown upon it by the sequel of the passage just quoted from Athenæus.

## SECTION II.—*On the Calendar dates of the three Hyakinthian Feriæ.*

Πολυκράτης ἐν τοῖς Λακωνικοῖς ἱστορεῖ ὅτι τὴν μὲν τῶν Ὑακινθίων θυσίαν οἱ Λάκωνες ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας συντελοῦσι, καὶ διὰ τὸ πένθος τὸ γενόμενον περὶ τὸν Ὑάκινθοι οὔτε στεφανοῦνται ἐπὶ τοῖς δεῖπνοις, οὔτε ἄρτου εἰσφέρουσι, ἀλλὰ πέμματα<sup>v</sup> καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἀκόλουθα διδῶσιν, καὶ τὸν εἰς τὸν θεὸν παιᾶνα οὐκ ἄδουσιν, οἷδ' ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον εἰσάγουσιν οὐδὲν, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις θυσίαις ποιοῦσιν· ἀλλὰ μετ' εὐταξίας πολλῆς δειπνήσαντες ἀπέρχονται. τῇ δὲ μέσῃ τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν γίνεται θεᾶ ποικίλη καὶ πανήγυρις ἀξιόλογος καὶ μεγάλη. παῖδες τε γὰρ καθαρίζουσιν ἐν χιτῶσιν ἀνεξωσμένοι, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄδοντες, πάσας ἅμα τῷ πλήκτρῳ τὰς χορδὰς ἐπιτρέχοντες, ἐν ῥυθμῷ μὲν ἀναπαιστῶ μετ' ὕξέος δὲ τόνου τὸν θεὸν ἄδουσιν. ἄλλοι δ' ἐφ' ἵππων κεκοσμημένοι τὸ θέατρον διεξέρχονται. χοροὶ τε νεανίσκων παμπληθεῖς εἰσέρχονται, καὶ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων τιὰ ποιημάτων ἄδουσιν· ὄρχησταί τε ἐν τούτοις ἀναμεμιγμένοι τὴν κίνησιν ἀρχαϊκὴν ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν ὠδὴν ποιοῦνται. τῶν δὲ παρθένων αἱ μὲν ἐπὶ κανάθρων, καμαρωτῶν ξυλίων ἄρμάτων, φέρονται πολυτελῶς κατεσκευασμένοι, αἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀμίλλαις ἄρμάτων ἐξευγμένοι πομπεύουσιν, ἅπαντα δ' ἐν κινήσει

<sup>t</sup> iv. 17.

<sup>v</sup> Cf. *supra*, page 337, the πέλανοι at Kyzicus.

καὶ χαρᾶ τῆς θεωρίας ἢ πόλις καθέστηκεν. ἱερεῖά τε παμπλήθη θύουσι τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην, καὶ δειπνίζουσιν οἱ πολῖται πάντας τοὺς γνωρίμους καὶ τοὺς δούλους τοὺς ἰδίους. οὐδεὶς δ' ἀπολείπει τὴν θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ κενουῖσθαι συμβαίνει τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὴν θέαν.

From the first part of this description it might be inferred that this ceremony of the Hyacinthia at Sparta had a special reference to the memory of Hyacinthus; and was in fact an annual repetition of the *πένθος τὸ γενόμενον περὶ τὸν Ὑάκινθον*: and it must be admitted that the external appearance of the first day, according to this account, was in character with such a reference; and wore a certain air of gravity or sadness proper for an occasion of mourning. Upon this question of the connection of the institution with the Hyacinthus of classical fable, we may have an opportunity of speaking hereafter. We are bound indeed, on the faith of the preceding statement, to infer that there must have been some connection between the ceremony and the name and memory of Hyacinthus; and that some of its characteristics externally must have been conformed thereto. But if the sole object of the institution had been to perpetuate the memory, and to mourn for the death, of Hyacinthus, it could have been nothing from the first either more or less than an annual parentalial ceremony; in which case, according to the Greek rule of the celebration of rites and ceremonies in honour of the manes of the dead<sup>x</sup>, it must have begun at night, and have been celebrated principally in the night: whereas it is clear, from the preceding account of it, that, according to its original and prescriptive rule, it was celebrated in the day time\*.

\* Nor is there any allusion to the Hyacinthia in classical antiquity, which would give any countenance to the supposition that they might have been celebrated in the night, except the following, in the Helene of Euripides, 1465 sqq.

Ἦ που κόρας ἂν ποταμοῦ  
παρ' οἶδμα Λευκιππίδας, ἢ πρὸ ναοῦ  
Παλλάδος ἂν λάβοις,  
χρόνῳ ξυελθοῦσα χοροῖς  
ἢ κώμοις Ὑακίνθου,  
νυχίαν εὐφροσύναν,

<sup>x</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, i. 181 n.



But, in the next place, it is plainly implied in the preceding description, that whatsoever might have been the external characteristics of the first day of the solemnity, the second or middle day at least exhibited no such appearances: Τῇ δὲ μέσῃ τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν γίνεται θεὰ ποικίλη καὶ ποινήγυρις ἀξιόλογος καὶ μεγάλη. There could have been no *holiday* in the Spartan calendar. if this second day of the Hyakinthia was not one; if the music, the songs, the dances, the processions, the sacrifices, the banquets and entertainments of *this* day did not make it one. On the contrary, it is abundantly clear from the account of this day, that it was the most festive and joyous for the whole Spartan community in the entire year. Of no day in the calendar, so far as we know, but this could it have been affirmed with truth, Ἄπαντα ἐν κινήσει, καὶ χαρᾷ τῆς θεωρίας, ἣ πόλις καθέστηκεν—Οἰδεὺς δ' ἀπολείπει τὴν θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ κενούσθαι συρβαίνει τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὴν θεάν: i. e. Sparta was emptied of its inhabitants on these occasions—which is understood, as soon as it is known that the Hyakinthia were celebrated at Amyclæ, and Amyclæ was two miles distant from Sparta. On no day but this was there so much to be seen, and so much curiosity to see it: so much freedom of intercourse among all orders and ranks of persons, and such indiscriminate hospitality,

ὃν ἐξαμιλλησάμενος  
 τρόχῳ τέρμονα δίσκου  
 ἔκανε Φοῖβος, τᾷ Λακείνῃ γᾶ  
 δὲ βούθυτον ἀμέραν  
 ὁ Διὸς εἶπε σέβειν γόνος.

But even here the proper day of Hyakinthus, (instituted by command of Apollo himself,) is called βούθυτος ἀμέρα: which is not the language in which Euripides would have spoken of a parentalial ceremony, or ἐνάγισμα, properly so called. The χοροὶ and the κῶμοι too, styled in this passage those of Hyakinthus, would be incompatible with the description of any thing but a festival of some kind. If night is alluded to in the νυχίαν εὐφροσύναν, also mentioned, it is because even the ἐορταί, or feasts of the Greeks, properly so called, were παννυχίδες, beginning in the evening after sunset, and lasting all night.

And this may be the reason why Jerome, *Contra Jovinianum*, i. Opp. iv. Pars ii. col. 186 a, seems to designate the Hyakinthia as a ceremony of the night: Victis Lacedæmoniis, et quodam tempore *nocturna sacra celebrantibus* quæ vocabantur Hyakinthina &c.

from which the slaves and menials themselves were not excepted—so that the Spartan Hyacinthia were so far *their* Saturnalia—*δειπνίζουσιν οἱ πολῖται πάντας τοὺς γνωρίμους καὶ τοὺς δούλους τοὺς ἰδίους*. It was no doubt this day, and the ceremonial of this day, which rendered the Hyacinthia in the eyes of strangers the most striking of the observances of the Spartans; and gave name to the month Hecatombæus, as the month of the Hyacinthia in particular. It is clear therefore that the first part of the above description of Polycrates, so far as it might seem to be an account of the solemnity in general, must be received with some qualification. The first day of the ceremony might have been characterised by a certain appearance of melancholy, which would have been suitable for an occasion of mourning; but the second could not possibly have been so, nor, for any thing which appears in the account, the third.

Again, it may be collected from the above description, that the dances and songs, and we may presume the music, which still made part of the ceremonial of this day in the time of Polycrates, were archaic or antique of their kind; i. e. characteristic of an æra long since passed, and presenting the same kind of contrast with the improvements of later times in these respects, as the songs and dances of the Salii, of the age of Numa, may be supposed to have done with those of the time of Augustus. The explanation of this no doubt is, that the proper ceremonial of this day, as a stated part of that of the Hyacinthia in general, was of very ancient date. It had been ordered and prescribed at a period of very remote antiquity, when everything might have been in character with the time; and having been kept up since by an uninterrupted observance, it was naturally nothing more nor less in the time of Polycrates than a memento of an age long gone by, with everything most proper and peculiar to it.

Again, it may be inferred from the same account that, whatsoever besides might have been proposed by the institution of this solemnity, its principal end and design must have been to do honour to Apollo. Even the ceremonial of the first day must have had that object in view, if the Pæan, for special reasons, was purposely suppressed on that day; for the

Præan, as every one knows, was the proper name of the ὕμνος, or hymn, to Apollo in particular: and if there were special reasons for suppressing that part of the regular service in honour of Apollo on this first day, it is implied thereby that but for those reasons, it must have been observed on this day, as much as on any other; while as to the ceremonial of the second day—the songs, the music, the dances, and all its other distinctive peculiarities, it is expressly said, were in honour of “The god,” i. e. of Apollo. It follows, that while the whole of the ceremony in some sense or other was intended to be in honour of Apollo, this second day must have been so in a manner peculiar to itself. The first day was sacred to him too, but not so exclusively that the memory of Hyakinthus might not appear to be dividing it with him, and imparting to this one day an air of melancholy and dejection, which it could not have derived from its relation to Apollo. Nothing of this kind however was to be discovered in the second day. It belonged entirely to Apollo, and its external appearance was consistent with that relation. Nothing reserved, nothing forbidding, nothing melancholy, much less funereal, would have been in character with that day, and nothing sad was to be discovered upon it. It was totally and entirely an holiday, as became the day sacred to Apollo in particular.

Of all the inferences then, relating to this ancient Spartan observance, which might be certainly or probably derived from the preceding account, one of the most reasonable would be this—That while the whole of the Hyakinthian solemnity must have been intended more or less in honour of Apollo, the rites and ceremonies of the second day must have been eminently and exclusively so. There must have been some special reason which connected Apollo with the middle day of the solemnity, more closely than with either of the other two. And if that is a just and legitimate inference from such premises, it is very important to the discovery of the calendar date of the ceremony. The Hyakinthian feriæ being three in number, and no more, we collect from this description that if any one of these three was more sacred to Apollo than another, it must have been the second; and knowing as we do that, from the time of Philammon of

Delphi, and of the institution of the Pythian *Ennead*, B. C. 1222, one day of the month became more sacred to Apollo than the rest, and assuming only that the Hyakinthian institution at Sparta was not so old as the Pythian at Delphi, we draw from both these facts together the inference to which they so naturally lead; viz. that the second of the Hyakinthian *feriæ*, which in its own solemnity appears to have been so peculiarly sacred to Apollo, was in all probability that particular day of the calendar which, since the time of the Pythian institution, had become in the estimation of the Greeks the day sacred to Apollo. And this day having been the seventh of the month, it follows that the second of the Hyakinthian *feriæ* also must have been the seventh of the month; and therefore the first must have been the sixth, and the third must have been the eighth. In other words, the calendar dates of the Hyakinthian *feriæ*, at the first institution of that solemnity, were the sixth, the seventh, and the eighth of the proper lunar or the proper solar month. This conclusion we shall proceed to confirm by actual proofs of the fact.

SECTION III.—*On the Calendar Dates of the Hyakinthian Feriæ, and on their relation to the moon, B. C. 479.*

It has been seen<sup>y</sup> that B. C. 479, in the year of the battle of Plataea, the Hyakinthia were celebrated at Sparta on the 27th, the 28th, and the 29th, of the Spartan Hecatombæus, or the Attic Hecatombæon, the Julian July 30, 31, and August 1, respectively; and this fact at first sight appears contradictory to the conclusion to which we have just come, that the calendar dates of the Hyakinthian *feriæ* must have been the sixth, the seventh, and the eighth of the solar or lunar month.

But that even such a contradiction might turn out to be after all more seeming than real, could not be considered impossible by any one who reflected on the peculiar anomaly which lunar and solar time, in that particular combination to which we give the name of the octaëteric cycle, in the nature of things, were liable to exhibit, It was a necessary consequence of such a combination, that, if a given lunar

term continued true to itself, it must differ more and more with the course of time, from a given solar one. This law was well known and understood by the Greeks from the time of Solon downwards; and allowance being made for it in the administration of the two systems, its practical operation and effect in every type of the cycle, from the time of Solon downwards, are seen to have been the same, viz. that whensoever the true relation of a particular observance to lunar time, for special reasons, required to be constantly kept in view, the original calendar date of the observance was cyclical, i. e. it rose with successive cycles from one solar term to another, it was never stationary in terms of the calendar for more than eight years at a time. On this principle, it is easy to see that if a given lunar date, at the beginning of an octaëteric period of 160 years, set out on a given solar one at the beginning of the month, towards the close of the period it must be found coinciding with some solar term at the end.

Now B. C. 479, the year of the battle of Plataea, was the 114th year of the proper Period of the first Type of the Hellenic Octaëteris, Cycle xv. 2; and in the 114th year of the octaëteric Period, the Lunar Precession (the advance of true mean lunar time, on nominal lunar or calendar solar time) amounted to 21 days exactly<sup>z</sup>—and consequently the seat of the true Luna prima being the 22d of the month, that of the true Luna sexta was the 27th, and that of the true Luna septima was the 28th, and that of the true Luna octava was the 29th. It follows that in the year of Plataea, the 27th, the 28th, and the 29th of Hecatombæus, in the Spartan calendar of the time being, were the seats of the true Luna 6<sup>a</sup>, and 7<sup>a</sup>, and 8<sup>a</sup>, respectively: and consequently, these three solar terms of that time being the calendar dates of the three Hyakinthian feriæ, the lunar dates of these three feriæ at the same time also must have been the 6<sup>a</sup>, the 7<sup>a</sup>, and the 8<sup>a</sup> respectively\*.

\* This has been proved by calculation, B. C. 479; see *supra*, Vol. i. page 412. The date of the mean full moon of August that year at Sparta was determinable by calculation to August 8, 23 h. 47 m. 45 s.:

<sup>z</sup> Vol. i. page 42.

The inference from these facts is obvious; viz. that the three Hyakinthian feriæ in the first instance must have been three lunar, not three solar, terms; and these three lunar terms the Luna sexta, the Luna septima, and the Luna octava: which having been transferred from their proper calendar to the octaëteric, B. C. 592, and retaining their proper relation to the moon in that calendar ever after, B. C. 479 were necessarily falling where, from contemporary testimony to the matter of fact, they are actually seen to have been; viz. on the 27th, the 28th, and the 29th of their proper month.

SECTION IV.—*On the original Epoch of the Hyakinthia; and on the date of their institution.*

The testimony to the rule of the Hyakinthia, extant at present, is to be understood first and properly of the rule in the Octaëteric Correction, or in the subsequent Metonic one, of the Spartan calendar; and as the former came into being B. C. 592, we must go back to that year, to discover the Julian date to which the first of the Hyakinthian feriæ, the Luna sexta, was attached at the epoch of the Correction.

Now the stated Julian date of the seventh month in the first year of the first cycle of the Octaëteris of Type i. (whether the Attic Hecatombæon or the Spartan Hecatombeus) being July 15, and in that year of the cycle the first day of any of the months being true to the moon; if Hecatombeus was the Hyakinthian month in this correction, the Julian date of the first of the Hyakinthian feriæ, the true mean Luna sexta, in the first year of the first Period and the first Cycle of the proper Octaëteric Correction of the Spartan calendar, must have been July 20.

Now this is an important step towards the discovery of the epoch of the Hyakinthian institution itself. For as this institution was much older among the Spartans than their octaëteric correction, B. C. 592, we cannot hesitate to conclude that, if it had a stated lunar date in the first year of this correction, it must have had the same in its proper ca-

from which we obtain the mean new moon last before, July 25, 5 h. 25 m. 44 s.; and consequently the 6th, the 7th, and the 8th of that moon July 30, 31, and August 1, respectively—the Julian dates of Hecatombeus 27, 28, 29, respectively, Cycle xv. 2. of the Spartan calendar also.

lendar before. Its date in this correction, and at this time, must have been its proper date in some older and preexisting calendar—transferred to this octaëteric correction just at this point of time. And if there was a proper Hyakinthian epoch, before and up to this point of time, there must have been a proper lunar Hyakinthian calendar before and up to this point of time. And if there was a proper lunar Hyakinthian calendar up to this time, no one can hesitate to conclude that it must have been an octaëteric one of its kind. The analogy of the Pythian, the Carnean, and even the Parthenian institution, can leave no doubt that, if a proper lunar calendar came into existence along with the Hyakinthian institution, as one did with each of those, it must have been an Ennead of some kind or other.

Here then it is proper to observe that, if there was a proper Ennead, by which the Hyakinthian solemnity was regulated from the first, and if the proper Hyakinthian epoch, transferred from this Ennead, B. C. 592, to the octaëteric correction of the Spartan calendar, then coming into being, was the Luna sexta of the seventh month, and the Julian date of the Luna sexta of the seventh month in that correction, at that time, was July 20; the Julian date of the proper Hyakinthian epoch in its own Ennead, just at the same point of time, must have been July 20 too: from which it will follow, that 160 years before it must have been July 19—and 320 years before it must have been July 18—and so on.

We have often had occasion to explain that though the period of the ἀποκατάστασις in the octaëteric cycle is a term of 160 years, yet even at the end of that number of years the same lunar date does not return to the same Julian one, but to the next above it<sup>a</sup>; so that in bringing down a succession of cycles and periods of this kind from a given lunar epoch to the same perpetually, it is necessary to raise the Julian epoch of the succession one day at the end of each, and, in tracing it backwards, (the lunar epoch remaining the same in terms perpetually,) to lower the Julian epoch one day at the beginning of each.

On this principle, if the regular lunar epoch of the Hyakinthian feriæ, both in the octaëteric correction of the Spar-

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. i. page 40.

tan calendar, and in its own *Ennead*, B. C. 592, was the *Luna sexta*, and the proper Julian date of the *Luna sexta* at that time was July 20, then 160 years before, B. C. 752, the lunar epoch being still the *Luna sexta*, the Julian must have been July 19; 320 years (two periods of 160 years) before, B. C. 912, the lunar epoch remaining still the same, the Julian must have been July 18; 480 years (three periods of 160 years) before, B. C. 1072, the lunar epoch being still the *Luna sexta*, the Julian must have been July 17. If then the Hyakinthian *Ennead* was just 160 years, or one period, old B. C. 592, its epoch must have been July 19, the *Luna sexta*, B. C. 752: if just 320 years or two periods old, it must have been July 18, the *Luna sexta*, B. C. 912; if just 480 years or three periods old, it must have been July 17, the *Luna sexta*, B. C. 1072.

The question then which necessarily suggests itself here is, How far back the Hyakinthian institution may be supposed to have gone beyond the date of the correction of the calendar at Sparta, B. C. 592? In answer to which we may observe that evidence is extant that it was older at Sparta than the last year of the second Messenian war, B. C. 668, and older than the tenth year of the first, B. C. 733; but no evidence is anywhere extant that it was older than the return of the *Heraclidæ*: nor, in fact, if it took its rise among the Spartans, (that branch of the family of the *Heraclidæ* which settled in Laconia,) and was characteristic of them in particular, from the nature of the case, could it have been older at Sparta than the return of the *Heraclidæ*.

But the date of this return, as determined by that of the *Carnean Ennead*, which arose out of it, being B. C. 1097; the date of the Hyakinthian institution, even if as old as B. C. 1072, would still be 25 years later than the return of the *Heraclidæ*, and the settlement of the Spartans in Laconia. And, assuming that it was actually instituted B. C. 1072, and the Hyakinthian *feriæ* were actually attached at that time to the *Luna sexta*, the *Luna septima*, and the *Luna octava*, July 17, 18, and 19 respectively, then these lunar terms remaining ever after the same, at the end of one period of 160 years, B. C. 912, their Julian dates would be July 18, 19, and 20; at the end of two periods, B. C. 752, these dates



would be July 19, 20, and 21; at the end of three, B. C. 592, they would begin to be July 20, 21, and 22—as they appear to have been *de facto* at this very time—if at least they were now transferred from their own cycle to that of the lunar correction of the Spartan calendar just coming into being. For these were the three Julian terms which corresponded to the Luna sexta, the Luna septima, and the Luna octava of the seventh month, Period i. 1. Cycle i. 1. of that correction, July 20, 21, and 22, B. C. 592: and if to the Luna sexta, septima, and octava of the seventh month, to the Luna sexta, septima, and octava of the month Hecatombeus; and if of the month Hecatombeus, to the Luna sexta, septima, and octava of the proper Hyakinthian month in the Spartan calendar, from the date of the correction downwards.

SECTION V.—*On the historical occasion of the institution of the Hyakinthia.*

It could scarcely be required from us that we should produce proof from testimony of the actual institution of the Hyakinthia, at so remote a point of time as B. C. 1072: and yet no one could reasonably object to such a contingency *a priori* that it was anything incredible. There is no limit to the possible date of an institution like this, but what is prescribed by the nature of the case; viz. that, if it was intended from the first in honour of Apollo, it could not have been older than the institution of the Pythian Ennead, and the introduction of the name and worship of Apollo among the Greeks, both which, as we hope to see hereafter, came into being together, B. C. 1222.

An allusion however to a particular incident in ancient Spartan history is found in Pindar; which, along with the commentary of the scholia upon it, is calculated to illustrate in the first place the motive to the institution, or the occasion out of which it arose, and in the next place, through the light which it throws upon the occasion, the date of the institution also.

Τίνι τῶν πάρος, ᾧ μάκαιρα Θήβα,  
καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεὸν  
εὔφρανας .. ..  
ἢ Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν ἀνίκ' ὀρθῶ  
ἕστασας ἐπὶ σφυρῶ

Λακεδαιμονίων, ἔλον δ' Ἀμύκλας  
 Αἰγείδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι  
 μαντεύμασι Πυθίοις<sup>b</sup> ;

On which the commentary of the scholiast is as follows :

Αἰγείδας νῦν οὐκ ἂν εἴη λέγων τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· περὶ γὰρ Θηβαίων ὁ λόγος· καὶ εἰσὶν Αἰγείδαι φατρία Θηβαίων, ἀφ' ἧς ἠκόν τινες εἰς Σπάρτην Λακεδαιμονίοις βοηθήσουτες ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀμυκλαεῖς πολέμῳ, ἡγεμόνι χρησάμενοι Τιμομάχῳ, ὃς πρῶτος μὲν πάντα τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον διέταξε Λακεδαιμονίοις, μεγάλων δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡξιώθη τιμῶν· καὶ τοῖς Ἰακινθίοις δὲ ὁ χαλκῆος αὐτοῦ θώραξ προτίθεται· τοῦτον δὲ Θηβαῖοι ὄπλον ἐκάλουν. ταῦτα ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Λακῶνων πολιτείᾳ. ἔνιοι δὲ φασι τὸν Πίνδαρον νῦν μὴ τοῦ πρὸς Ἀμυκλαεῖς πόλεμον μνημονεύειν, μηδὲ τῶν σὺν Τιμομάχῳ Αἰγείδων, ἀλλὰ τῶν σὺν τοῖς Ἡρακλείδαις εἰς Πελοπόννησον κατελθόντων, ὧν Ἀριστόμαχος ὁ Κλεάδα καὶ Κλεάδας ὁ Ὑλλου ἡγοῦντο. καὶ γὰρ τότε Θήβηθεν ἦκειν τοῖς Δωριεῦσι τοὺς ἀψαμένους τῆς καθόδου Αἰγείδας μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων· εἶναι δὲ τοὺς Θήβηθεν Αἰγείδας τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Ἀθηναίους. δυεῖν οὖν ἀποστάσεων ἐκ τῆς τῶν Αἰγείδων τῶν Θηβαίων φατρίας εἰς Σπάρτην γεγυνομένων, ἔργον ἀποφύγασθαι ποτέρας ὁ Πίνδαρος νῦν μνημονεύει. μήποτε δὲ τῆς δευτέρας. Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ φησιν ὅτι πολεμοῦντες οἱ Λάκωνες Ἀμυκλαεῶσιν, ὧς ἐπύθοντο παρὰ θεοῦ τοὺς Αἰγείδας συμμάχους λαβεῖν, εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐπορεύοντο· καταλύσαντες δὲ ἐν Θήβαις, εὐωχομένης τῆς τῶν Αἰγείδων φατρίας ἐκλήθησαν· ἀκούσαντες (δὲ) μετὰ δείπνον εὐχομένου τοῦ ἱερέως διδόναι τοῖς Αἰγείδαις τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ ἀγαθὰ, καὶ ξυμβαλόντες τὸν χρησμὸν, ἐντεῦθεν ἔλαβον τὴν ξυμμαχίαν\*.

\* There is another passage in these scholia which ought to be compared with the preceding ; the comment on Pyth. v. 96—

Τὸ δ' ἐ-  
 μὸν γάρνεν τ' ἀπὸ Σπάρ-  
 τας ἐπήρατον κλέος,  
 ὅθεν γεγενναμένοι  
 ἴκοντο Θήρανδε φῶ-  
 τες Αἰγείδαι ἐμοὶ πατέρες—

Θέλει δεῖξαι τὸν Ἀρκεσίλαον τὸ γένος κατάγοντα ἀπὸ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν. διτταὶ δὲ αἱ τῶν Θήβηθεν Αἰγείδων εἰς Σπάρτην ἀφίξεις· προτέρα μὲν ἢ σὺν τοῖς Δωριεῦσι καὶ Ἀριστοδήμῳ, ἧς μέμνηται Ἐφορος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ λέγων Ὑλλον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς ἀποτυχόντας τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν Σπάρτην στρατείας,

<sup>b</sup> Isthmia, vii. 1-22.

ἐπερωτῶν τὸν θεὸν τίνας τῶν Ἑλλήνων ποιήσονται πρὸς τὴν κάθοδον ξυμμάχους· τὸν δὲ ἀνελεῖν τοὺς ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους εὐεργετηθέντας, πρώτους δὲ τούτους κελεῦσαι Αἰγείδας παρακαλεῖν. ἵπολαμβάνοντας δὲ ταῦτα εὐλόγως προστεταχέναι τὸν θεὸν ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας πρῶτον, εἰδότας Θησέα τὸν Αἰγέως μέγιστα πάντων ἰφ' Ἡρακλέους εὐεργετημένον, εὖ δὲ ἔχειν τὴν μαντείαν νομίζοντας, (καὶ) πρώτους τοὺς Θησέως ἀπογόνους ἐκάλουν (δεῖν καλεῖν), τοῦ τῆς καθόδου μὴ διαμαρτεῖν. ἔπειτά φασι τὸν Ἀριστόδημον διὰ τῆς Βοιωτίας πορευόμενον καταλαβεῖν θύοντάς τινας τῶν Θηβαίων παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ τοῦ κήρυκος ἀκούσαντα τοῖς Αἰγείδασι εὐχομένου τὰ ἀγαθὰ, λαβεῖν περὶ τῆς μαντείας ἔννοιαν, καὶ νομίσαντα (corr. νομίσαι) δεῖν, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς Ἀθήνηθεν Αἰγείδας πρώτους παρακαλοῦντες διημάρτανον, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Θηβῶν ξυμμάχους μετελθεῖν προτέρους. κατὰ τύχην δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ στρατείᾳ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν τὴν Πελοπόννησον κατασχόντων, ἡγούντο τὸ μαντεῖον εἰρήσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐν Θήβαις Αἰγειδῶν. ἑτέρα δὲ ἢ σὺν Τιμομάχῳ, ἐν ᾧ πρὸς Ἀμυκλαεῖς Λακεδαιμονίους καθιεστήκει πόλεμος. τινὲς δὲ Αἰγέα, ἀφ' οὗ ἢ τῶν Αἰγειδῶν ἐν Θήβαις φατρία τοῦνομα ἔλαβε, Σπαρτὸν εἶναι τῶν ἀπὸ Κάδμου<sup>1</sup>.

This account professes to be taken from Ephorus; and even this recognises two occasions on which these Ægidæ rendered an essential service to the Heraclidæ; one, at the return of the whole body, the other, in the war of a part of them (the Spartans) with the people of Amyclæ; and this latter that in which Timomachus took the lead. Yet this account as given by Ephorus does not appear to have been so true to the actual course of things as that of Aristotle, supra, in his *Λακῶνων πολιτεία*. According to the former, the Ægidæ on both occasions must have come from Thebes; but the truth seems to have been that the Ægidæ who assisted the Heraclidæ on the first occasion, (that of the return,) came from Athens—those who assisted these Spartans, on the second occasion, in the war with the Amycleans, came from Thebes. That the Athenians did assist the Heraclidæ on their *final* attempt to return, we have the testimony of Tyrtæus<sup>2</sup>—

Οἷσιν ἄμα προλιπόντες Ἐρινεὸν ἠνεμόεντα  
εὐρείαν Πέλοπος νῆσον ἀφικόμεθα.

Ephorus too appears to have confounded the discovery of the Ægidæ at Thebes, and the manner in which it was made, with the circumstances of the first application to them at Athens. In other respects the tradition relating to this discovery would be an internal argument of the truth of either account. For, as we have seen from the Dissertation on the Parthenian Ennead, there was an annual festival at Thebes, called the *Δαφνηφορία*, the date of which was the 7th of the primitive Thoth, or primitive Gamelion—which might have been going on when the Spartan messengers were passing through Thebes, on either of these occasions. B. C. 1072 however, Æra cyc. 2935, the 7th of the primitive Thoth was falling on May 21—and supposing that to have been the time and occasion actually meant by the tradition, between this day and July 17, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Herodotus, iv. 149: Pausanias, iii. ii. 6: xii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Fragm. v. Cf. Strabo, viii. 5. 184 b.

We learn from these explanations that there was a particular *Φατρία*, or *Φρατρία*, at Thebes, (a *gens* or *family*,) older there than the return of the Heraclidæ, yet which came originally from Athens, and was called *Αἰγείδαι*, i. e. the descendants of Ægeus; consequently through Theseus, (the only son of Ægeus known to history,) and the sons of Theseus. Theseus himself, by Homer and Hesiod, is styled *Αἰγείδης*—

Θησεία τ' Αἰγείδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν<sup>c</sup>.

And as Theseus had several sons, all of whom, as well as himself, when he was dispossessed of the monarchy by Menesthes, B. C. 1202<sup>d</sup>, were compelled to migrate for a time from Athens, it is not improbable that some of them might settle at Thebes, and become the founders of a family there, called after them that of the Ægidæ; nor that, if they did, some of this family, on two several occasions, might be the means of rendering an important service to the Heraclidæ—once, to the whole body, at the time of their last attempt to return, and again, to the Spartan division of the entire body, in the reduction and conquest of Amyclæ.

We observe too that though the Scholiast at first thought it doubtful to which of these two occasions the allusion in Pindar was to be referred, yet he came to the conclusion at last that it must have been the second; as indeed the text of Pindar clearly implies, by restricting it to the capture of Amyclæ—

Ἔλον δ' Ἀμύκλας  
Αἰγείδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι.—

And Pindar's testimony in this respect was confirmed by Aristotle's, *Ἐν τῇ Λακόνων πολιτείᾳ*, with the addition of some further circumstantial particulars, which do not appear in

first of the Hyakinthian feriæ, there would still be an interval of 57 days to account for every thing which might have intervened between the application to the Ægidæ at Thebes, and the institution of the Hyakinthia, B. C. 1072, including the reduction of Amyclæ; which, according to tradition, was betrayed<sup>3</sup>; and therefore must have so much the more speedily fallen into the hands of the Spartans.

<sup>c</sup> Iliad. A. 265 : Hesiod, Scut. 182.

<sup>d</sup> Supra, Vol. iv. page 511.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Phot. Bibl. codex 186. pag. 136. 16. Conon. *Διήγησις* λ5' : Pausanias, iii. xiii. 2, and Strabo, viii. 6. 188 b.

this allusion of Pindar's, and therefore could not have been derived from Pindar; viz. that the Ægidæ on this occasion were commanded by a leader, (probably the head of the family for the time being,) whose name was Timomachus; that this Timomachus, besides the immediate use he was of to the Spartans in the reduction of Amyclæ, laid the foundation of their military discipline, and on both accounts was honoured at Sparta ever after in a special manner. Aristotle seems also to have recorded another important particular of the circumstances of this event, which, for anything which appears in Pindar at present, he could have derived only from tradition; that the Spartans having been previously directed by the oracle (no doubt the Pythian) to call in the Ægidæ, and naturally supposing that these were to be found at Athens, were on their way to Athens to make application to them there, and were passing through Thebes for that purpose, when they discovered the branch of the family resident there, and that these were the Ægidæ to whom the oracle meant them to apply.

We may safely therefore conclude that there was an historical foundation for these ancient Spartan traditions; that the *Αίγείδαι*, a branch of the lineal descendants of Ægeus, through Theseus, did some time render an important service to the Spartans in particular; and that these facts were not only traditionally known to Pindar and Aristotle, but also believed by them. And we may justly infer from the preceding accounts, that though this service, so rendered to the Spartans, must have been a distinct thing from any similar service rendered by the same family to the Heraclidæ in general, it could not have been much later; and to the Spartans in particular it was of material assistance even towards the end and effect of the return itself. Pindar himself implies that but for this assistance the Spartans would not have been able to settle securely in their own country. The Dorian colony, i. e. the Spartan part of it in particular in Laconia, was *set on its feet*, as he expresses it, (i. e. enabled to stand securely and firmly in the possession of the country which had just been allotted it,) by this reduction of Amyclæ, which they owed to the cooperation of the Ægidæ more

than to anything else. If so, this reduction too could not have been much later than the return.

This fact then that the reduction of Amyclæ, and the final conquest of the whole of Laconia, by the Spartans, was principally due to Timomachus and his Ægidæ, being taken for granted, it is almost selfevident that the institution of the Hyakinthia must have arisen out of it. The circumstances of that event, as handed down traditionally, explain the rule and ceremonial of the Hyakinthia; and the rule and ceremonial of the Hyakinthia attest in their turn the traditionary account to which we are attributing their institution.

For i. The Hyakinthian institution was intended in honour of Apollo; and as the application of the Spartans to the Ægidæ, with a view to the reduction of Amyclæ, was made by the direction of the oracle, nothing could be more probable *a priori* than that an institution, which commemorated the success of that application and the final reduction of Laconia, would be intended in honour of the divinity, Apollo, which had both directed what should be done, and had rendered it successful.

ii. The honours paid to Timomachus, the leader not only of the Ægidæ, but, as it is inferred, of the Spartans also, on this occasion, were paid at the Hyakinthia; which must be decisive that the occasion on which he had rendered the service, for which he was thus honoured, and the Hyakinthia, were closely connected. The breastplate which he had worn on this occasion, (called by the Thebans ὄπλον, the armour,) was produced every year at the Hyakinthia; and that implies, that it was preserved down to the latest times as a memorial of him.

iii. The Hyakinthia, in some sense or other, with respect to their proper locality, were peculiar to Amyclæ; i. e. there was a closer relation between the Hyakinthia and Amyclæ than between the Hyakinthia and any other locality in Laconia, Sparta itself not excepted—Amyclæ, Laconia civitas sacra Apollini, in qua Hyakinthus in agone celebratur<sup>e</sup>. The δῆμος of Amyclæ, from time immemorial, claimed the leading part in the ceremonies of the Hyakinthia; the hymn

<sup>e</sup> Lactantius, in Statii Thebaid. iv. 223.

or Pæan at least, in honour of Apollo, as we learn from Xenophon<sup>f</sup>, could be sung by none but them. And this too would be only consistent, if the Hyakinthian institution itself arose out of the conquest of Amyclæ by the Spartans at the time of the return, and out of its incorporation with the rest of the body politic at Sparta, on the same occasion; and still more so, if there was a more ancient institution at Amyclæ itself, before the return of the Heraclidæ, on which this Hyakinthian one was grafted. In like manner, the principal temple of Apollo, among the Spartans, was at Amyclæ, though Amyclæ was 20 stades distant from Sparta<sup>g</sup>; and τὸ Ἀμυκλαῖον, with the ellipsis of ἱερόν, was the common mode among them of speaking of his temple<sup>h</sup>.

v. The fable relating to Hyakinthus, believed as it was to have been connected with the institution of the Hyakinthia from the first, leads to the same conclusion, that the birth-place of the institution must have been Amyclæ, and the Hyakinthia, in some sense or other, must have been peculiar to Amyclæ. For though the parentage of the Hyakinthus of this fable is not uniformly represented, yet, according to the most authentic form of the tradition, he was the son of the founder of Amyclæ, himself called Amyclas; and he met with his death at Amyclæ: and he was buried in the temple of Apollo at Amyclæ; and it was a stated part of the ceremonies of the Hyakinthia to parentate to his memory under the altar of Apollo in Amyclæ: Ἀμύκλας δὲ ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος...πόλισμα ἔκτισεν ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ. γενομένων δὲ οἱ παίδων, Ἰάκινθον μὲν νεώτατον ὄντα καὶ τὸ εἶδος κάλλιστον κατέλαβεν ἢ πεπρωμένη πρότερον τοῦ πατρός. καὶ Ἰακίνθου μνήμᾳ ἐστὶν ἐν Ἀμύκλαις ὑπὸ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος<sup>i</sup>—Τοῦ δὲ ἀγάλματος τὸ βᾶθρον παρέχεται μὲν βωμοῦ σχῆμα, τεθάφθαι δὲ τὸν Ἰάκινθον λέγουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἰακινθίοις πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος θυσίας ἐς τοῦτον Ἰακίνθου τὸν βωμὸν διὰ θύρας χαλκῆς ἐναγίζουσιν· ἐν ἀριστερᾷ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ θύρα τοῦ βωμοῦ<sup>k</sup>.

Whether these facts of the personal history of Hyakinthus in themselves were true or false, the inference from them as to

<sup>f</sup> Hellenica, iv. v. 11.

<sup>g</sup> Polybius, v. 19. 2, 3: cf. Pausanias, iii. xviii. 5, 6: Strabo, viii. 5. 185 b.

<sup>h</sup> Thucydides, v. 23: Strabo, vi. 3.

44 a.

<sup>i</sup> Pausanias, iii. i. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. iii. xix. 3.

his connection with the Hyakinthia, through his connection with Amyclæ and the Amyclæan Apollo, is the same in either case. Amyclæ must have been the seat of the Hyakinthian solemnity from the first, and no locality in the whole of Laconia could have been so closely connected with the Hyakinthian observance as Amyclæ. All this is explained by the tradition relating to the conquest of Amyclæ, if the institution, among the Spartans at least, arose out of it; and still more so, if there was an older institution at Amyclæ itself, in honour of a certain Hyakinthus also, which the Spartans adopted and incorporated with their own from the first: of which coincidence we hope to speak more particularly by and by.

We think then that, assuming the substantial truth of this tradition, on the authority of Pindar and Aristotle, we may conclude, with every presumption of probability, that the historical occasion of the Hyakinthian institution was the reduction of Amyclæ, a few years after the occupation of the Peloponnese by the Heraclidæ; in which the Spartans were assisted by the Ægidæ from Thebes, under Timomachus. We know too little of the actual circumstances of the resettlement of the Heraclidæ to speak with confidence on any point connected with it. Yet it is neither inconceivable nor incredible *a priori* that the reduction of Amyclæ might be absolutely necessary to the security of the Spartans in the possession of Laconia; that it might be the principal and strongest city of Laconia at this time, whatsoever it afterwards became; and that, if not able to effect its reduction of themselves, acting under the direction of the Pythian oracle, (which was in existence long before this time, and the authority of which was now everywhere acknowledged,) they should have applied to the Ægidæ, just as their posterity, under similar circumstances, applied to the Athenians in the second Messenian war. Still less so that, as a memorial of the success of this application, they should have founded a solemnity in honour of the Apollo, to whom it was ultimately due.

We may conclude therefore that, as the Carnean institution arose out of the settlement of the Heraclidæ in the Peloponnese generally, so this Hyakinthian one was ulti-



mately due to that of the Spartans in particular in Laconia : and either of these things *a priori* was just as possible and as probable as the other. On this principle, the proper date of the latter would be later *de facto* than that of the other, and yet approach very nearly to it ; as B. C. 1072, our assumed date of the Hyakinthian institution, does to B. C. 1096. that of the Carnean. And as the Carneæ were associated from the first with an Ennead of their own, so might the Hyakinthia be ; and this Ennead, as the proper cycle of an institution which was closely connected with Amyclæ from the first, and possibly too with a certain Hyakinthus, might be called either the Amyclæan or the Hyakinthian.

It remains then to be considered whether these conclusions, respecting the probable origin of the institution, will explain and account for the fact of its having been attached to a triple epoch, the Luna sexta, the Luna septima, and the Luna octava ; to which, as we have seen, it must have been, if the date of its institution was B. C. 1072, just three periods of 160 years before B. C. 592.

SECTION VI.—*On the original Lunar dates of the Hyakinthian Feriæ, the Luna sexta, the Luna septima, and the Luna octava.*

In order to this discovery, the first thing necessary is to consider the relation of this Amyclæan or Hyakinthian Ennead in the year of its institution to the Pythian of the time being ; since nothing could be more improbable *a priori* than that, in fixing the epoch of an Ennead, destined for the regulation of a festival, which was about to be instituted in commemoration of recent events, so interesting and so important to the whole of the Spartan community, and in honour of Apollo, to whom they were due, no regard would be paid to his own cycle, the proper Pythian Ennead of the time being.

The date of this Ennead, as we have often observed, was B. C. 1222 ; and its lunar epoch, as we hope to see hereafter, was nominally the Luna septima, and in the year of its institution, the Luna septima of the moon of August—August 26, B. C. 1222. Our assumed date of the Amyclæan Ennead, B. C. 1072, was 150 years later than this. The proper date therefore of the Amyclæan Ennead in terms of

the Pythian, was Cycle xix. 6, the sixth year exeunte; and in the sixth year of the Pythian Ennead, the stated Julian date of the first month was August 29, that of the last was July 19. The sixth year of Cycle xix of the Pythian æra therefore would begin August 29, B. C. 1073, and end August 18, B. C. 1072: and the stated Julian epoch of the xiith moon of this year, and the third of the assumed dates of the Hyakinthian institution, July 19, B. C. 1072, would be the same. This coincidence, in our opinion, is competent to explain the third of the Julian dates of the Hyakinthian feriæ, July 17, July 18, and July 19. It might be, and it probably was, fixed upon at this time as the proper date of the last month in the sixth year of the Pythian cycle of the time being; and therefore, according to the assumptions of the reckoning of lunar time in the Pythian cycle, (by virtue of which the numenia of every month represented the Luna septima,) as the day sacred to Apollo in his own cycle, and as the representative of the Luna septima, on the principles of the Pythian Ennead, in *this* cycle, as much as in its own.

With respect to that of the second; it is to be observed that the Pythian numenia at the time of the institution represented properly the seventh of the solar month, and nominally only the seventh of the lunar: and if any regard was to be paid to the true Luna septima, in fixing the epoch of the Hyakinthian Ennead, B. C. 1072, the Pythian date of that lunar term for the time being would require some correction. Our general lunar calendar, Period x. xi. 7, shews the new moon of Thammuz July 11 at midnight, B. C. 1072; and that this is correct is proved by calculation, which determines the new moon of July, B. C. 1072, for the meridian of the ancient Sparta, as nearly as possible to July 11 at midnight also\*. And the numenia or Luna prima of that moon, reckoned from the phasis, being assumed July 12 at midnight, the Luna septima, reckoned from the Luna prima in

\* B. C. 1072, we have by calculation—

		h.	m.	s.	
Mean new moon	July 11	6	34	18	m. t. Greenwich.
	July 11	8	4	1	m. t. Sparta.
True new moon	July 10	21	27	26	m. t. Greenwich.
	July 10	22	57	9	m. t. Sparta.

the sense of the phasis, would fall July 18 at midnight. And this being the date of the second of the first Hyakinthian feriæ, July 18, B. C. 1072, and the date of the day which, as we have seen, both in this first instance, and ever after, was of all the three the most properly sacred to Apollo, no conjecture can be more probable than that it was purposely fixed upon in this instance, as the representative of the true Luna septima, dated from the phasis, and through that of the day truly sacred to Apollo even on the principles and assumptions of the Pythian institution itself.

We have thus accounted for the original dates of two out of the three Hyakinthian feriæ; viz. the third, represented at that time by the Julian July 19, B. C. 1072, as the Luna septima of the Pythian Ennead, and the second, similarly represented by July 18, as the true Luna septima of the time being, and therefore the true day, sacred, in that capacity, even to the Pythian Apollo. We have still to account for the first, the representative of which at the same point of time was July 17, B. C. 1072. With respect to this Julian term, though it must have coincided with the Luna sexta, dated from the phasis, if July 18 did so with the Luna septima, and July 19 with the Luna octava—we should be of opinion that this coincidence was accidental, and, in fixing upon this day as the first of the three Hyakinthian feriæ, was not purposely and primarily regarded. The true explanation of this date is to be found in the fact that it was the proper date for the time being of that older and preexisting observance at Amyclæ in honour of Hyakinthus, to which we have already alluded, as probably associated with this institution of the Spartans from the first. But this is a question, on which we hope to enter more particularly by and by.

SECTION VII.—*Amyclæan or Hyakinthian Octaëteris. In four Types, 160 years asunder, from B. C. 1072 to B. C. 592.*

Type i. B. C. 1072.			Type ii. B. C. 912.		
B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.	B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.
1072	i	July 17	912	i	July 18
71	ii	— 6	911	ii	— 7
70	*iii	June 25	910	*iii	June 26
*1069	iv	July 13	*909	iv	July 14
68	*v	— 2	908	*v	— 3
67	vi	— 21	907	vi	— 22
66	vii	— 10	906	vii	— 11
*1065	*viii	June 28	*905	*viii	June 29

  

Type iii. B. C. 752.			Type iv. B. C. 592.		
B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.	B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.
752	i	July 19	592	i	July 20
751	ii	— 8	591	ii	— 9
750	*iii	June 27	590	*iii	June 28
*749	iv	July 15	*589	iv	July 16
748	*v	— 4	588	*v	— 5
747	vi	— 23	587	vi	— 24
746	vii	— 12	586	vii	— 13
*745	*viii	June 30	*585	*viii	— 1

In the construction of each of these Types nothing is assumed, except that the epoch of the first, July 17, was raised one day at the beginning of each of the rest; in all, three terms, July 17–July 20, from B. C. 1072 to B. C. 592: and this is no more than the necessity of the case requires, if the proper Hyakinthian epoch, B. C. 592, was falling *de facto*, as it appears to have been, on July 20. The asterisks on the left of the years before Christ denote the leap-years in the vulgar æra B. C., and those on the left of the years of the cycle denote the intercalary years of the cycle. But whether the alternation of the months in the cycle was from 29 to 30 days, or from 30 to 29, in each of these Types, we cannot undertake to say.

SECTION VIII.—*On the original date of the first of the Hyakinthian Feriæ; and on the connection of the institution with the personal history of Hyakinthus.*

With respect to this question, it may be observed i. that, for anything on record at present to the contrary, this na-

tional solemnity of the ancient Spartans, the most remarkable in their calendar, was never known among them by any name but that of the Ἰακίνθια. ii. That the etymon of such a name could never have been anything but Ἰάκινθος. Ἰάκινθος ὁ... τὰ Ἰακίνθια εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰακίνθου: a gloss which probably stands out of its place in the text at present, and should have come after Ἰακίνθια, just before: Ἐορτὴ ἐν Λακεδαίμονι (εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰακίνθου.) iii. That this word Ἰάκινθος in Greek is properly the name of a flower; the same which in Latin, according to Dioscorides, was called vaccinium or ulcinum, and in most of the languages of modern Europe is still known by the name of the hyacinth: and must be too familiar to our readers to require any further description. And from this fact it may be justly inferred that, as the name of a person or a place among the Greeks, it must have been borrowed from the flower: if the flower at least must have been so called before anything else could have been. iv. That nevertheless, this name of Ἰάκινθος was applied both to persons and places among the Greeks. Thus, in the gloss of Photius on the word Παρθένοι: Τὰς Ἐρεχθέως θυγατέρας οὕτως ἔλεγον καὶ ἐτίμων. ἦσαν δὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἕξ . . . , τούτων λέγεται Πρωτογένεια καὶ Παρθώρα δοῦναι ἑαυτὰς σφαγήναι ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας, στρατιᾶς ἐλθούσης ἐκ Βοιωτίας. ἐσφαγιάσθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰακίνθῳ καλουμένῳ πάγῳ ὑπὲρ τῶν Σφενδορίων. διὸ καὶ οὕτως καλοῦνται Παρθένοι Ἰακινθίδες, καθάπερ μαρτυρεῖ Φανόδημος ἐν τῇ ἐΐ' Ἀτθίδι, μεμνημένος τῆς τιμῆς αὐτῶν, καὶ Φρύνιχος Μουστρόφῳ<sup>k\*</sup>.

v. Tradition is uniform and consistent with itself in connecting this Hyakinthian institution with the name of an Hyakinthus, both intended and understood to have been that

\* Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, iii. xv. 8, calls these the daughters of Ἰάκινθος, the Spartan, who had migrated from Sparta to Athens; and supposes them to have been sacrificed by the Athenians, in order to appease the anger of the gods, in the war with Minos, which arose out of the death of Androgeus. The name of Ἰάκινθος indeed might have been given to the locality where such a sacrifice as this took place; but there is no reason in the nature of things why it might not have been given to any locality where the hyacinth abounded, particularly as a flower of the early spring, and as beautiful as any of the first productions of that season.

ἰ Hesychius.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Hesychius, Παρθένοι: Ἰακινθίδες: Suidas, Παρθένοι: Ἰακινθίδες.

of a person. The memory of an Hyakinthus was annually commemorated by it, and the first of the Hyakinthine feriæ derived its proper character from its relation to this Hyakinthus: from which fact, along with the etymological explanation of the name on grammatical principles, we cannot hesitate to conclude that the institution itself borrowed its name from this Hyakinthus.

vi. Tradition is uniform also in assigning an high degree of antiquity to this Hyakinthus; insomuch as it has connected both him and the institution called after him with a fable, which would prove, if true, that he was older than the flower called *Ῥάκιθος* itself. And though it is not necessary to believe this part of the tradition, yet while the fact of the supposed connection between the Hyakinthus of the institution and the flower so called is indisputable, we may justly contend that the fable itself is a strong internal argument of the distance of time to which the real history of such a person must have gone back, to serve as the basis of such a fable.

vii. It appears from the testimony of Pausanias<sup>1</sup>, that the Hyakinthus of the Hyakinthian institution both lived and died at Amyclæ, and was buried at Amyclæ, and even in the temple of Apollo at Amyclæ; which last circumstance of his history must imply a very close connection between him and the Amyclæan Apollo—and consequently, if the Amyclæan Apollo could not have been anything different from the Pythian Apollo, between him and the Pythian Apollo. It appears also from it, that this Hyakinthus was the son of the founder of Amyclæ—who died in the life-time of his father at an early age, and therefore not long after the foundation of Amyclæ itself: *Ἀμύκλας δὲ ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος, βουλόμενος ὑπολιπέσθαι τι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐς μινῆμην, πόλισμα ἔκτισεν ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ. γενομένων δὲ οἱ παίδων, Ῥάκινθον μὲν, νεώτατον ὄντα καὶ τὸ εἶδος κάλλιστον, κατέλαβεν ἢ πεπρωμένη πρότερον τοῦ πατρὸς*<sup>m</sup>. It confirms this statement of Pausanias, that if Amyclæ was founded at this time, it must have been considerably older than the Trojan æra; and it is recognised by Homer as in existence at that time, among the other towns of Sparta—

Οἶ τ' ἄρ' Ἀμύκλας εἶχον<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, page 447.

<sup>m</sup> iii. i. 3.

<sup>n</sup> *Iliad*. B. 584.

It appears too from his own testimony that he was aware of the historical fact of the conquest of Amyclæ by the Dorians, after the return of the Heraclidæ, and he supplies an additional particular in its subsequent history, which is important on the present question; viz. that before this reduction Amyclæ was a place of consequence, though, from the time of that event, and in consequence of it, it dwindled to the rank of a village, much below its original dignity<sup>o</sup>: Ἀμύκλαι δὲ ἀνάστατος ὑπὸ Δωριέων γενομένη, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου κόμη διαμένουσα κ', τ. λ. It follows that no such institution as the Hyakinthia at Amyclæ, and in memory of the Amyclæan Hyakinthus, could have been later than this conquest of Amyclæ by the Dorians: and if anything of that kind did ever take place there, it must have been long before the return of the Heraclidæ.

The problem then which we have still to solve being this, Why the name of this ancient Spartan observance from the first should have been that of the Hyakinthia, and why this name should have been taken from that of a certain Hyakinthus, and why that one of the days of this observance which was devoted to the memory of this Hyakinthus should have been July 17; laying together the above considerations, we are of opinion that the most natural solution of the problem, and the most in accordance with the tradition and belief of antiquity, is to suppose that an Amyclas was actually the founder of Amyclæ; that Hyakinthus was actually the son of this Amyclas; that he actually died in early life, and possibly in the way which the fable represented him to have done—of an accidental blow from a discus of antiquity; and that a parential ceremony to his memory was actually instituted at the time, and kept up ever after. None of these suppositions is *a priori* improbable, much less impossible; neither the premature death of a youth, occasioned by an accident; nor the institution of an annual memorial of it. To account after this for the connection of these Hyakinthia with the institution of later date, in honour of the Amyclæan Apollo, which commemorated the conquest of Amyclæ, we have only to suppose that the stated epoch of these earlier Hyakinthia, and that of the Amyclæan Eunœad, as first instituted

B. C. 1072, were coinciding; and that too would be explained if the proposed date of this Amyclæan *Ennead* was July 18, and the stated date of the earlier institution was either a fixed Julian term, July 17, or a cyclical one which at this time was falling on July 17.

On this principle, the original epoch of the Hyakinthia of later date might require to be determined to the three Julian terms, July 17, July 18, and July 19, and therefore to the three lunar terms, which were corresponding to those three Julian ones, the *Luna sexta*, the *Luna septima*, and the *Luna octava*, respectively. And these having been fixed upon as the first and proper dates of the Hyakinthian *feriæ*, in terms of their own *Ennead*, instituted at the same time, they would continue the same ever after, down to B. C. 592 itself.

This is consequently the conclusion to which we may come as the result of all our premises; viz. that the proper date of the institution, as determined to this year, B. C. 1072, was the *Luna septima* of the month of July—but the *Luna septima* with a double relation, one to the *Luna septima* of the Pythian cycle for the time being, the other to the true lunar term of that denomination, as properly sacred to Apollo; and therefore with a double Julian date, July 18, as the representative of the latter, B. C. 1072, and July 19, as that of the former: but that, for the special reasons of the case, and because of an accidental coincidence of the proper date of the older institution at Amyclæ with the day before the first of these terms, it took in also the *Luna sexta*, and its Julian representative for the time being, July 17. We shall therefore take our leave of this subject, with a brief notice of the fable, relating to the transformation of Hyakinthus into the flower so called.

The hyacinth in all climates is one of the flowers of spring, and for the climate of Greece it was one of those of the early spring\*. So that if the fable in question is any argument of the historical account of the death of Hyakinthus, it must have happened in the spring. And this appeared to Ovid so natural an inference from it, that he did not hesitate to accommodate his own to it; dating both the death of Hy-

\* Cf. Theophrastus, *Histor. Pl.* vi. 8. 1, 2.



kinthus, and the first appearance of the flower which sprang up out of his blood, on the confines of winter and spring; i. e. just as the sun was passing from the last of the signs of winter, to the first of those of spring<sup>n</sup> —

Te quoque, Amyclide, posuisset in æthere Phœbus;  
 Tristia si spatium ponendi fata dedissent.  
 Qua licet, æternus tamen es: quotiesque repellit  
 Ver hiemem, Piscique Aries succedit aquoso,  
 Tu toties oreris, viridique in cæspite flores.

Claudian also describes both this and the Narkissus as productions of the spring—

Te quoque, flebilibus mærens Hyacinthe figuris,  
 Narcissumque metunt, nunc inclyta germina veris,  
 Præstantes olim pueros: tu natus Amyclis;  
 Hunc Helicon genuit: te disci perculit error;  
 Hunc fontis decepit amor: te fronte retusa  
 Delius; hunc fracta Cephissus arundine luget<sup>o</sup>.

But if the assumptions and circumstances of the fable are to be construed historically, we must go further, and date the first institution of the Hyakinthia simultaneously with the first appearance of the flower, at that season of the natural year when the west wind began to blow; for the death of Hyacinthus, according to the fable, was due to the jealousy of Zephyrus, whom Apollo had superseded in his affections. Coluthus, *De Raptu Helenæ*, describing the sights which Paris, upon his arrival at Sparta, was supposed to have seen, enumerates one among the rest, which represented the death of Hyacinthus<sup>p</sup>.

Ἄρτι μὲν αἰπύδητα φιλοξείνων ναετήρων  
 δώματα παπταίνων καὶ γείτονας ἐγγύθι νηοῦς,  
 ἄσπετος ἀγλαίην διεμέτρεεν· ἔνθα μὲν αὐτῆς  
 χρύσειον ἔνδαπίης θεγύμενος εἶδος Ἀθήνης,  
 ἔνθα δὲ Καρνείοιο παραγνάμψας Ἰακίνθου,  
 ὅν ποτε κουρίζοντα σὺν Ἀπόλλωνι νοήσας  
 δῆμος Ἀμυκλαίων ἠγάσσατο, μὴ Διὶ Λητῶ  
 σκυζομένη καὶ τοῦτον ἀνήγαγεν· αὐτὰρ Ἀπόλλων  
 οὐκ ἔδάη Ζεφύρω ζηλήμονι παῖδα φυλάσσων,  
 γαῖα δὲ δακρύσαντι χαρισσαμένη βασιλῆϊ  
 ἄνθος ἀνηέξῃσε παραίφασιν Ἀπόλλωνι,  
 ἄνθος ἀριζήλοιο φερώνυμον ἠβητηῆρος.

<sup>n</sup> *Metam.* x. 162. cf. 215.

<sup>o</sup> *De Raptu*, ii. 131.

<sup>p</sup> vers. 231 = 235 sqq.

In like manner, Nonnus, in his description of the gardens of Electra, in Samothrace, and Cadmus' visit to them<sup>r</sup>.

Πολλὰ δὲ Φοιβείοισι σοφοῖς ποικίλλετο φύλλοις  
 γράμματα δενδρήεντα φιλοκλαύτων ὑακίνθων  
 καὶ Ζεφύρου πνείνοντος ἀξιφύτου διὰ κήπου  
 ἄστατον ὄμμα τίταινε πόθων ἀκόρητος Ἀπόλλων,  
 καὶ φυτὸν ἠβητῆρος ἰδὼν δεδονημένον αὔραις,  
 δίσκου μνήστιν ἔχων ἐλελίζετο, μήποτε κούρω  
 ζηλήμων φθονέσειε καὶ ἐν πετάλοισιν ἀήτης  
 εἰ ἐτεόν ποτε κείνον ἔτι σκαίροντα κονίη  
 ὄμμασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν ἰδὼν δάκρυσεν Ἀπόλλων,  
 καὶ τύπος ἀνθεμόεις μορφώσατο δάκρυα Φοίβου,  
 αἴλιον αὐτοκέλευστον ἐπιγράψας ὑακίνθω.

So also Philostratus, in his *Icones*, *Hyakinthus*<sup>s</sup>: Καὶ θρηνεῖ αὐτὸ ἄμα τῷ ἠρι (ἢ Ὑάκινθος), γένεσιν οἶμαι παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβοῦσα ὅτε ἀπέθανεν—'Αμαθίης γε ὁ Ζέφυρος, νεμεσήσας αὐτῷ, καὶ τὸν δίσκου εἰς τὸ μειράκιον ἐπαφείτ'—'Ορᾶς δὲ οἶμαι αὐτὸν (τὸν Ζέφυρον) ἐν πτηνῷ τῷ κροτάφῳ, καὶ ἄβρω τῷ εἶδει. καὶ στέφανον φέρει πάντων (τῶν) ἀνθέων· μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον καὶ τὸν Ὑάκινθον αὐτοῖς ἐμπλέξει<sup>v</sup>—'Ωραι· μὴ πατεῖτε τὴν Ὑάκινθον, ἢ τὰ ρόδα, οὐκ ἐρῶ πρὸς τὰς ἠρινάς (scil. ὄρας)<sup>x</sup>.

And yet to suppose the true time of the death of Hyakinthus to have agreed with these suppositions, would be totally at variance with our conclusions respecting the date of the Spartan Hyakinthia, or the still earlier one of the Amyclæan. The stated time of the Ζεφύρου πνοῇ, as we have often observed, in all the Parapegmata of antiquity, was about the middle of the winter quarter, forty-five days after the winter solstice, and forty-five before the vernal equinox<sup>y</sup>. It is satisfactory therefore that, with respect to this point, we have it in our power to appeal from one testimony of this kind, which would date the death of Hyakinthus in the early spring, to another, which would date it in the middle of summer; and from the fable which attributed it to the jealousy of the west wind, to that which ascribed it to the jealousy of the north wind, the stated season of which was the summer. Servius, ad Virg. Eclog. iii. 63, Sua munera, observes, Nam scimus...et Hyakinthum amatum tam a Borea quam ab Apol-

<sup>r</sup> iii. 153.

<sup>s</sup> Ὑάκινθος, i. 766 B.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. 767 B.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. C.

<sup>x</sup> Ὠραι, ii. 830 D. cf. Pausanias, iii.

xix. 4.

<sup>y</sup> See Vol. i. 291 n : Vol. ii. 275 n.

line: qui cum magis Apollinis amore lætaretur, dum exerceretur disco ab irato Borea eodem disco est interemptus, et mutatus in florem nominis sui. The season of the north winds for the climate of Greece was that of the Etesian winds, from the last ten days of July to the first two or three of September. This version of the fable therefore would be consistent with the true date of the death of Hyakinthus, even if supposed to have been one of these three, July 17, 18, or 19, much more if some day in August. It is manifest however that no historical authority can be attributed to either fable; or of the two, only to the latter. The former is confuted by its incompatibility with the true chronology both of the Amyclæan and of the Spartan Hyakinthia; and could have had no foundation except in the name of the Amyclæan Hyakinthus itself, as the same with that of the well-known flower of the early spring\*.

\* It is far from improbable that the true explanation of the mystery connected with the Hyakinthus of the Amyclæan institution, as we have already suggested<sup>1</sup>, is the fact that by a singular, though not an impossible, coincidence the date of his death (and that as the consequence of an accident, such as is implied in the fable relating to it) was as nearly as possible that of the Pythian ennead, instituted by Philammon, B. C. 1222, and attached to August 26. The name and worship of the Pythian Apollo were introduced at the same time; and that being the case, it is easy to see that two such coincidences as these might have supplied all the foundation, which would be necessary, even for the most remarkable circumstances of the classical fable, in which the traditional history of Hyakinthus was embodied; viz. that the young and beautiful Apollo, and the young and beautiful Hyakinthus, being so nearly on a par in point of age, the latter might naturally be represented as the favourite of the former. And his death having happened in the summer season, and in the midst of the period for which the Etesian winds were wont to blow, the ultimate cause of his death might come to be attributed to the jealousy of Boreas, the god of the Etesian winds, on whom his youthful charms had made the same impression as on Apollo, but whom Apollo had superseded in his affections.

And besides these fabulous circumstances of his history, this coincidence would account for those other particulars, concerning which, as matters of fact, there is no good reason to doubt; his being buried in the temple at Amyclæ, and the connection of the parentalia to his memory every year with the stated services of the Amyclæan Apollo himself. For though the introduction of the worship of the Pythian Apollo into Amyclæ

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, page 461.

must have been later than the death of Hyacinthus, we are at liberty to suppose it might not be much later—that the death of Hyacinthus might have been still a very recent event, when the name and worship of Apollo were introduced into Amyclæ. We are at liberty also to suppose, that, if Hyacinthus really died in early life, and in the lifetime of his father, (both the founder and the king of Amyclæ,) the worship of Apollo, introduced into Amyclæ so soon after his death, must have been introduced by Amyclas; and this would account, in the most natural manner, for the fact that the altar of the Amyclæan Apollo stood upon the tomb of Hyacinthus—the tomb of Hyacinthus served as the pedestal of the altar\*—and the temple of the Amyclæan Apollo, which enclosed the one, enclosed the other. These are strong grounds of presumption that the burial-place of Hyacinthus at Amyclæ was purposely selected as the site of the temple of Apollo there; that the tomb was purposely converted into the altar, and the temple was purposely built about both. It is far from impossible even that Amyclas might indeed, to deify his young and beautiful son, thus prematurely cut off in the prime of life, under the name of the Amyclæan Apollo<sup>2</sup>. The connection at least between the Amyclæan Hyacinthus and the Amyclæan Apollo having been once established, (no matter for what reason, and in what way,) the invention of the later poets would supply the rest; how he had been the favourite of Apollo, and of Boreas the god of the Etesian winds also; how he had fallen a victim to the jealousy of the latter, while the winds, over which he had the control, and of which he made use to give effect to his jealousy, were still continuing to blow; and how he had been turned by the Apollo of his affections into the flower from which he derived his name: for that was most probably the form which the fable first assumed, viz. that Hyacinthus was converted into the flower from which he derived his name—not that the flower was produced by his death, and called after him.

Now assuming, as we conjectured supra<sup>3</sup>, that the day of the death of Hyacinthus, and the day sacred to his memory, was a certain day of the

\* Pausanias, iii. xix. 3: Τοῦ δὲ ἀγάλματος τὸ βᾶθρον παρέχεται μὲν βωμοῦ σχῆμα, τεθάρθαι δὲ τὸν Ἰακίνθον λέγουσιν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ Ἰακινθίοις. . . ἐς τοῦτον Ἰακίνθῳ τὸν βωμὸν διὰ θύρας χαλκῆς ἐναγίζουσιν. That is, this βᾶθρον, or pedestal, used as the altar of the Amyclæan Apollo, was in reality the tomb of Hyacinthus; and consequently hollow, as a tomb or sepulchre necessarily would be, with a brass door in one of its sides, through which it was usual at stated times (the first day of the Hyacinthia, no doubt, reckoned from sunset or evening) to introduce ἐναγίσματα (i. e. χοαί, or such offerings as admitted of being poured into a cavity of any kind) to the *manes* supposed to reside within. Nothing can prove more clearly than this description, that this conversion of the tomb into an altar must have been an afterthought—that the tomb was there, before it was yet used as an altar—and consequently before the temple, which enclosed it, was built.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the Wisdom of Solomon, xiv. 15. Cicero, in like manner, as it appears from his Epistles, under the in-

fluence of the same feelings, would have deified his daughter Tullia.

<sup>3</sup> Page 456.

primitive equable calendar, which, B. C. 1072, in the year of the institution of the Hyakinthian, or Amyclæan ennead, was coinciding with July 17; this coincidence enables us to discover the equable date of his death. B. C. 1072, in the Æra Vulgaris, corresponded to Æra Cyc. 2935: in which year the first of the primitive Thoth falling on May 15 at midnight, the first of the primitive Phaophi was falling on June 14 at midnight, and the first of the primitive Athyr on July 14 at midnight, and therefore the fourth on July 17 at midnight. On this principle the traditional date of the death of Hyakinthus, in the primitive equable calendar, must have been Athyr 4. And that being assumed accordingly, if we go back 150 years, from B. C. 1072, Æra Cyclica 2935, we come to B. C. 1222, Æra Cyclica 2785, when the first of Thoth was falling June 21 at midnight, and the first of Phaophi July 21 at midnight, and the first of Athyr August 20 at midnight, and the fourth of Athyr August 23 at midnight; only three days earlier than the epoch of the Pythian ennead, instituted the same year, Athyr 7, August 26 at midnight. On this principle, there must have been only a difference of three days between the date of the death of Hyakinthus, Athyr 4, August 23, this year, and the date of the birth of Apollo, Athyr 7, August 26, the same year: a coincidence which every one must allow to have been something remarkable, and well calculated to lay the foundation both of that real, and of that fabulous, connection between the Amyclæan Hyakinthus and the Amyclæan (or, what is the same thing, the Pythian) Apollo—which we have been endeavouring to explain and account for\*.

It remains then to consider briefly whether this assumed date of the death of Hyakinthus, B. C. 1222, will suit the chronology of his personal history, as far as it has been handed down. In the first place, according to Apollodorus<sup>3</sup>, he was the son of Amyclas and *Diomede*, daughter of Lapithus. Now this implies that Amyclas himself was a contemporary and equal in years of the Lapithæ, Piriouths, &c., whose age and that of Theseus were on a par: and consequently Hyakinthus, the son of Amy-

\* There cannot be much doubt that the poetical fable of the Pythian Apollo and Daphne also must have been invented to account for the relation between the Pythian Apollo and the Laurel, (*δάφνη* in Greek,) from the first. And herein we may remark this coincidence, that according to some of the Greeks, (Phylarchus, for instance, Plutarch, Agis, ix,) the *Δάφνη* of that fable was the daughter of Amyclas, and consequently the sister of Hyakinthus.

<sup>3</sup> Bibliotheca, iii. x. 3: cf. Pausanias, iii. i. 4. Servius indeed, ad Æn. xi. 69, speaks of Hyakinthus as the son of Eurotas, or Cēbalus. Cf. Ovid. Met. x. 162 and 196. The former, being the river which flowed through Sparta personified, would be a fabulous character, the latter might have been a real character; but even he, according to Pausanias, iii. i. 3, was the grandson of Amyclas. There can be no doubt

however that the real tradition of antiquity respecting the parentage of Hyakinthus, is represented most faithfully in the account of Pausanias, iii. i. 3, (supra 454,) which made him the son of Amyclas, and not much younger than the foundation of Amyclæ itself. And though there are some differences between this account and that of Apollodorus, they are not of material importance.

clas, must have been the contemporary and ὁμηλιξ of the sons of the Laphthæ, some of whom, as we have seen<sup>4</sup>, were forty-five or fifty years old in the last year of the siege of Troy, and consequently born B. C. 1225 or 1230. It appears from Apollodorus too<sup>5</sup>, that Kynortes, another son of Amyclas, and brother of Hyakinthus, according to Stesichorus was the grandfather of Tyndareus and Icarius—the former the father of Helen, the latter of Penelope—both of them probably born not much more than 30 years before the capture of Troy. Hyakinthus was probably much younger than Kynortes, and in point of age more strictly on a par with a son of Kynortes, than with Kynortes himself.

In the next place, it appears from Apollodorus also<sup>6</sup>, that Thamyris, the reputed son of Philammon, was a contemporary of Hyakinthus, and, according to the tradition here reported, the ἐραστής of Hyakinthus; Thamyris having been the first who set the example of this kind of love: Πρῶτος ἀρξάμενος ἐρᾶν ἀρρένων. Now this must imply a certain proportion between the age of Thamyris and that of Hyakinthus—such, that if it may be supposed Thamyris, as the son of Philammon, was about 20, B. C. 1222, Hyakinthus could not be supposed at the same time more than 14 or 15: from which we may infer, that he was about the age of an ἔφηβος at his death, B. C. 1222, and consequently born about B. C. 1237.

The fable of later times might have been easily suggested even by the name of Hyakinthus, along with what tradition had handed down of his untimely end; and certainly ought not to prejudice us against the supposition of his real existence. Pausanias did not believe in the truth of this fable; but he had no doubt of the actual existence of the Hyakinthus of the fable<sup>7</sup>: Περὶ δὲ ἀνέμου Ζεφύρου, καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ὑάκινθος ἀπέθανεν ἄκοντος, ἢ τὰ ἐς τὸ ἄνθος εἰρημένα, τάχα μὲν ἂν ἔχοι καὶ ἄλλως, δοκεῖτω δὲ ἢ λέγεται. The proper use of such a fable at present is to illustrate the chronology of the subject of it; and as a proof that the real facts of the history embodied in such a representation must go very far back.

And this leads us to observe that while this fable connected the origin of the Hyacinth with Hyakinthus, the son of Amyclas, another fable, if not everywhere, yet in Salamis at least, connected it with the death of Ajax: Ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα, observes Eustathius<sup>8</sup>, τοῦ Πορφυρίου . . . ὅτι Εὐφορίων λέγει τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ῥύεντος ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Αἴαντος σφαγῆς Ὑάκινθον ἐκφῦναι—Λέγουσι δὲ οἱ περὶ τὴν Σαλαμίνα οἰκοῦντες, ἀποθανόντος Αἴαντος τὸ ἄνθος ἐν τῇ γῆ σφισι τότε φανῆναι πρῶτον. λευκὸν ἐστίν, ὑπέρυθρον, κρίνου καὶ αὐτὸ ἔλασσον καὶ τὰ φύλλα, γράμματα δὲ ἔπεστιν οἷα τοῖς ὑακίνθοις καὶ τούτῳ<sup>9</sup>—Τὴν Ὑάκινθον φασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Αἴαντος ἀναδοθῆναι τοῦ ἐν Τροίᾳ μανέντος· διὰ τοι τοῦτο ἔχειν ἐγγεγραμμένον αἶ αἶ, τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Αἴαντος<sup>10</sup>. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν καὶ

<sup>4</sup> iv. 388 sqq. : 507 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> Loco citato.

<sup>6</sup> i. iii. 3.

<sup>7</sup> iii. xix. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Ad Iliad. B. 557. 285. 31.

<sup>9</sup> Pausanias, i. xxxv. 3.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Virgil, Eclogæ iii. 106--

SECTION IX.—*On the cases of the Hyacinthia mentioned in history before or after B. C. 592.*

i. It is recorded by Strabo, on the authority of the historian Antiochus, that the Παρθερέλαι or Παρθενέλαι, as they were called at Sparta, (i. e. the offspring of the intercourse which took place between the young men and the marriageable young women, in the first Messenian war,) by whom Tarentum was ultimately founded, under their leader Phalantus<sup>z</sup>, being now grown up, but dissatisfied with their position in Sparta, or disgusted with their treatment by the rest of the community there, entered into a conspiracy for the overthrow of the existing state of things; the execution of which was to have taken place at the Hyacinthia: *Συνέκειτο μὲν δὴ τοῖς Ὑακινθίοις ἐν τῷ Ἀμυκλαίῳ συντελουμένου τοῦ*

*γραπτῆν νῦν αὐτῆν εἶπεν* (sc. Theocritus)<sup>11</sup>. The question is then, Did this flower appear first after the death of Ajax, or was it in existence, under the name of the Hyacinth, before? For if it was, and even was derived from Hyacinthus, Hyacinthus was older than Ajax. Nor indeed does this tradition, relating to the death of Ajax, suppose the flower to have been first seen anywhere, after that event, but only in Salamis: for which possibly there might have been some foundation; since flowers have been known to appear suddenly in places where they had never been seen before. Servius observes on Virgil's allusion to this subject<sup>12</sup>, Hyacinthus enim ubique nascitur, flos, qui natus est primo de Hyacinthi sanguine, postea de Ajacis . . . sicut etiam Ovidius docet. est autem quasi liliū rubrum, designans primam Hyacinthi (Ὑακίνθου) litteram \* . . . nam flos iste Hyacinthi et non Ajacis nomen retinet. This implies that if we must judge of the real origin of the flower from the testimony of these two fables respectively—that which traced it up to Hyacinthus was older than that which referred it to Ajax; and therefore Hyacinthus was older than Ajax: and yet the latter fable will also imply that Ajax too could not have been much younger than Hyacinthus.

\* And this peculiarity of the flower, viz. its exhibiting on its petals the figure of the Greek Υ, would have supplied the best etymon of the name itself—if there had been such a word in Greek for that species of flowers to which the Hyacinth belongs—as ἕκινθος. For then this word would have denoted the Ὑ-ἕκινθος—the ἕκινθος discriminated from all others of the same class by this peculiar mark. But no such word occurs in Greek at present, for any description of flower, as ἕκινθος; though ἕκινθος does, for a different kind of flower.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Eustathius, ad Dionys. Perieg. 377.

<sup>11</sup> Schol. in Theocrit. ad Idyll. x. 28.

<sup>12</sup> Eclogæ, iii. 1c6.

ἀγῶνος ἡνίκα τὴν κυνήν περιθῆ ὁ Φάλαντος ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐπίθω κ', τ. λ. <sup>a</sup> The same account was given by Ephorus <sup>a</sup>, who specified further the date of the intercourse between the young men and young women, of which these Partheniæ were the fruit, as the *tenth* year of the first Messenian war. Their birth therefore must be dated in the *eleventh*; and as they must all have been born about the same time, they would all be ὁμίλικες—and attain to their maturity at once. We hope to shew on a future opportunity that the first Messenian war broke out in the summer of B. C. 743, and consequently that the Partheniæ must have been born B. C. 732.

Let us assume that they were 25 years old when they formed this design. That would be the case B. C. 708 or 707. So far back then (and no doubt much further) must the observance of the Hyakinthia at Sparta have gone. And on this occasion too, we see, it was going on, or expected to be, at Amyclæ; and the ἀγών, which made part of its ceremonial, was to take place in the temple of Apollo there. In the third Type of the Amyclæan *Ennead* <sup>b</sup> B. C. 707 answered to Cycle vi. 6: and the Hyakinthian feriæ that year were July 23, 24, and 25: and it is easy to see from the scheme of the Type <sup>b</sup>, what the same dates would be, for the five years before, and the five years after B. C. 707 respectively, B. C. 712–B. C. 702; from the 20th to the 30th year of the age of the Partheniæ, between which it is morally certain this incident in their personal history (which led in its consequences to the foundation of Tarentum) must have happened.

ii. It is recorded by Pausanias <sup>c</sup> that in the course of the second Messenian war the Lacedæmonians made a truce with the Messenians, for *forty* days; because the Hyakinthia were at hand: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ (ἐπήγει γὰρ Ἵακίνθια) πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῇ Εἴρᾳ τεσσαράκοντα ἐποιήσαντο ἡμερῶν σπονδὰς. καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀναχωρήσαντες οἰκάδε ἐώρταζον κ', τ. λ. This truce was consequently later than the beginning of the siege of Eira; and Eira began to be besieged B. C. 678: and to judge from the context this truce must have been concluded two or three years after. But the exact year is not necessary for our pre-

<sup>a</sup> Strabo, vi. 3. 44, 45.

<sup>b</sup> *Supra*, page 452.

<sup>c</sup> iv. xix. 3.



sent purpose. The coincidence to be remarked is this; that the truce was made because the Hyakinthia were at hand; and the Hyakinthia lasted only *three* days, and yet this truce was made for *forty*.

Now this is explained by the relation of the Hyakinthia to the Carneia every year; and especially at this time when the Hyakinthine feriæ were two days in advance of their original Julian dates, but the Carnean were the same as they had been at first. Forty days from the beginning of the Hyakinthia, at this period of the history of both these observances, would necessarily extend to the day after the last of the Carnean feriæ; as may be shewn by taking the first six years of the siege of Eira, and comparing the Hyakinthian epoch for each of them with the Carnean for each also.

*Amyclæan Ennead.*

Period iii. 75-80.

B. C.	Cycle x. 3-8.
678	June 27
*677	July 15
676	4
675	23
674	12
*673	June 30

*Carnean Ennead.*

Period iii. 99-104.

B. C.	Cycle xiii. 3-8.
678	July 28 — Aug. 5
*677	Aug. 15 — 23
676	4 — 12
675	23 — 31
674	12 — 20
*673	July 31 — 8

The Carneia, beginning 31 days later than the Hyakinthia, in each of these instances, and lasting nine days, would never be over before the 40th day from the first of the Hyakinthian feriæ inclusive. This must, no doubt, have been the reason why the truce was entered into for forty days. It was intended to take in the Carnean as well as the Hyakinthian holidays; in the former of which the Messenians were as much interested as the Spartans—if not in the latter also. This coincidence consequently is well calculated to illustrate both our Amyclæan and our Carnean Ennead at once. Nor was it peculiar to these six years, the first six of the siege of Eira. At this period of the decursus of the Amyclæan Ennead it would have held good of any year of the Third Period besides, compared with the corresponding one of the Carnean Ennead.

iii. These two are the only instances of any allusions to the Hyakinthia in contemporary history of which we are aware, down to the Correction of B. C. 592. From the date of this correction they are not unfrequent; and we may take it for granted that whensoever they occur, in the course of this interval, from B. C. 592 to B. C. 424, they are to be referred to the Octaëteric correction at Sparta; and from B. C. 424 downwards, to the Metonic: and the proper Hyakinthian dates in each case alike are to be understood of the 6th, the 7th, and the 8th of the Spartan month Hecatombæus; with this difference, that in the Octaëteric correction these three dates were attached to the 6th, the 7th, and the 8th of the true lunar month, but not to the 6th, the 7th, and the 8th of the solar one, so called, except for the first cycle; and in the Metonic correction they were attached to the 6th, the 7th, and the 8th of both alike. We do not consider it necessary to collect these different cases. The most important and most interesting of them is that of B. C. 392; which we shall have occasion to consider hereafter, and from which we hope to recover the original date of the institution of the Isthmian games.

SECTION X.—*On the Γυμνοπαΐδαι of the Spartans, and its Calendar-date.*

There was another institution among the Spartans, the name of which was that of the Γυμνοπαΐδαι; and as this ancient observance of theirs was annual like the Hyakinthia, and its date is determinable to the same month and almost to the same days of the month as the Hyakinthia, by way of corollary to the conclusions which we have thus established concerning the latter, we may proceed briefly to consider the state of the case with respect to the former.

In the first place, though nothing else had been on record, bearing on this question, it might have been inferred from an allusion to both these solemnities in conjunction, which occurs in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius, that both must have been commonly celebrated about the same time, but the Hyakinthia first and then the Gymnopædiæ<sup>d</sup>: Ἡ δὲ Ἑλλάς πῶς, ἔφη, περὶ αὐτῶν γιγνώσκει; Συριᾶσιν, εἶπεν, ὥσπερ ἐς τὰ

<sup>d</sup> vi. x. 292 A. B.

Ἰακίνθια καὶ τὰς Γυμνοπαΐδας θεασόμενοι<sup>e</sup>. In like manner it might have been inferred from the Scholia<sup>f</sup> on Plato, *De Legibus*<sup>g</sup>, that the *γυμνοπαΐδιαι* must have been celebrated notoriously ἐν ἡλίῳ, i. e. as the context implies, in the hottest season of the year; consequently after midsummer, as the *Hyakinthia* also were.

We deduce however the actual date of this Spartan festival principally from the following coincidences. The date of the battle of Leuctra, in the Bœotian calendar, was the 5th of Hippodromius<sup>i</sup>, or (as generally the same with that Bœotian date) the 5th of Hecatombæon<sup>k</sup>, B. C. 371. The Julian date of Hippodromius 5, the same year, was July 6; and as reduced to the Spartan Metonic calendar, Period i. 53, Cycle iii. 15<sup>l</sup>, July 6 was the 8th of Hecatombæus, the last of the *Hyakinthian feriæ* the same year, (Hecatombæus 8, July 6,) also.

Now Leuctra was 100 Roman miles distant from Sparta, in a right line, and 112 at least by road; and as the battle itself did not begin until after noon, and the contest was protracted to a late hour in the evening, it is morally certain that the event of it could not have been made known at Sparta, even by news carried express, in less than two days, July 7, and July 8, Hecatombæus 9 and 10, and part of a third, July 9, Hecatombæus 11, of the time being. We are told by Xenophon<sup>m</sup> that the news arrived when the *Γυμνοπαΐδιαι* were going on, and on the *last* day of the ceremony; and, as the context implies, about the noon of that day. If so, the last day of the *Γυμνοπαΐδιαι* that year was Hecatombæus 11; and if they lasted every year only two days, the first must have been Hecatombæus 10; if they lasted three days, it must have been Hecatombæus 9. And if any of these was their date in the year of Leuctra, the same must have been their date in every year before or after Leuctra.

Now that the *Γυμνοπαΐδιαι* could not have begun earlier than the 10th, may be inferred from the fact that the *Hyakinthia* did not end earlier than the 8th, and there could

<sup>e</sup> Cf. Maximus Tyr. vi. 8. pag. 59.

<sup>f</sup> Schol. ii. 450.

<sup>g</sup> Opp. Pars iii. tom. ii. 196. 8.

<sup>i</sup> See Vol. ii. page 319-322.

<sup>k</sup> Vol. ii. 83. Metonic dates.

<sup>l</sup> Vol. iii. Appendix, Table x.

<sup>m</sup> *Hellenica*, vi. iv. 16. cf. Agesilaus. also Plutarch, Agesilaus, xxix.

scarcely have been less than *one* day's interval between two such considerable solemnities, as the Hyacinthia and the *Γυμνοπαιδία*. And that they actually began on the 10th, may be inferred from the fact, that, as it appears from Athenæus<sup>n</sup>, it was one of the laws of Lycurgus, and one of the rules of public life at Sparta, that the young men (the *νέοι*) should pass naked before the ephors every ten days, in order to enable them to judge, from the evidence of their own eyes, whether they were getting too fat and lusty, or not: *Γυμνῶν κατὰ δέκα ἡμέρας παρισταμένων τοῖς ἐφόροις τῶν νέων*. These times were no doubt the 10th, the 20th, and the 30th of the Primitive equable month in the time of Lycurgus, or at that of the institution of the ephorship; and the 10th, the 20th, and the 30th of the lunar month, from B.C. 592 downwards. On this principle, the 10th of Hecatombæus would be the stated date of one of these reviews; and such a review in itself, from the nature of the case, would be very proper for one of the ceremonies, (and very probably the first or preliminary one,) of such an institution as the *Γυμνοπαιδία*, the principal actors in which, whether still boys, or young men, appear to have discharged their respective parts *in juris naturalibus*.

*Γυμνοπαιδία* ο. Ἐορτὴ Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐν ἣ παιῖδες ἦδον τῷ Ἀπολλωνῷ παιᾶνας γυμνοὶ εἰς τοὺς περὶ Θυρέαν πεσόντας—*Γυμνοπαιδία* ρ. Ἐν Λακεδαίμονι κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν παιῖδες γυμνοὶ παιᾶνας ἦδον εἰς τιμὴν τῶν περὶ Θυρέας—*Γυμνοπαιδία* ς. Ἐν Σπάρτῃ παιῖδες γυμνοὶ παιᾶνας ἄδοντες ἐχόρευον Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Καρνεῖῳ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πανήγυριν—*Σωσίβιος* ἐν τοῖς περὶ θυσίων (φησι)...*φέρειν* (δὲ) αὐτοὺς (the *στέφανοι* called *Θυραετικοὶ*) ὑπόμνημα τῆς ἐν Θυρέᾳ γενομένης νίκης τοὺς προστάτας τῶν ἀγομέων χορῶν ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ ταύτῃ, ὅτε καὶ τὰς γυμνοπαιδίας ἐπιτελοῦσι ς—*Γυμνοπαιδεία* ς. Ἡ παλαιστρα ἢ τοὺς ἐφήβους Λυκοῦργος ἠνάγκαζε, καὶ *Γυμνοπαιδία* χοροὶ ἐκ παίδων ἐν Σπάρτῃ...εἰς θεοὺς ὕμνους ἄδοντες εἰς τιμὴν τῶν ἐν Θυραϊαῖς ἀποθανόντων Σπαρτιατῶν—*Γυμνοπαιδία* τ. Ἐτιοὶ μὲν ἐορτὴν φασὶ Σπαρτιατικὴν, ἐν ἣ τοὺς ἐφήβους κύκλῳ περιθεῖν τὸν ἐν Ἀμυκλαίῳ βωμὸν, τύπτοντας ἀλλήλων τὰ νῶτα. ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ ψευδῆ. ἐν γὰρ ἀγορᾷ ἐορτάζουσι· πληγαὶ δὲ οὐ γίνονται, ἀλλὰ πρόσθοοι χορῶν γεγυμνωμένων—*Χορὸς* δὲ οὗτος ὁ τύπος (the ἀγορὰ of Sparta) καλεῖται πᾶς, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς *Γυμνοπαιδείαις* (ἐορτῇ) δὲ εἴ τις

<sup>n</sup> xii. 74.

ο Etym. M.

ρ Anecdota, 32. 18.

ς Ibid, 234. 3.

τ Athenæus, xv. 22.

θ Suidas.

ι Hesychius.

ἄλλη καὶ αἱ Γυμνοπαιδία διὰ σπουδῆς Λακεδαιμονίοις εἰσὶν) ἐν ταύταις οὖν οἱ ἔφηβοι (corr. Ἔφοροι) χοροὺς ἰσῆσαι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι<sup>v</sup>—Puerorum nudum certamen primum actum in Lacedæmone<sup>x</sup>—Γυμνὴ παιδεία πρῶτον ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ἤχθη<sup>y</sup>—Nudipedalia primum acta in Lacedæmone<sup>z</sup>.

From the last of these entries it must be inferred that Jerome took *Γυμνοπαιδία* in Greek to mean the same thing as *Nudipedalia* in Latin, the *barefoot* solemnity in English, unless he read in the text of Eusebius *Γυμνοπόδια* for *Γυμνοπαιδία*. It is observable however that he dates the institution Olymp. xxvii. 3, B. C. 670, Eusebius, Olymp. xxviii. 4. or xxix. 1. B. C. 665, or 661. Corsini adopted the former date, but Mr. Clinton prefers the latter; and *this* may be said in favour of the latter, that, supposing the date of the institution to have been taken from the Amycnean Ennead of the time being, Olymp. xxix. 1, B. C. 661, was the first year of Cycle xii. of Type iii. of that Ennead<sup>a</sup>, when the epoch was falling on July 19. And the Hyakinthia bearing date July 19, 20, and 21, the first *Γυμνοπαιδία* would bear date July 23\*.

\* Plutarch, *De Musica*, ix. mentions that as the musical Carnean solemnity had a musical character derived from Terpander, contemporary with its institution, so had the *Γυμνοπαιδία* a somewhat different but equally characteristic style, derived from other celebrated musicians, either of the same age as the institution, or subsequent to it.

Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη κατάστασις τῶν περὶ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ Τερπάνδρου καταστήσαντος γεγένηται (at the first musical Carnea there): τῆς δευτέρας δὲ Θαλήτας τε ὁ Γορτύμιος (of Gortyna in Crete, καὶ Ξενοδόμος ὁ Κυθήριος, καὶ Ξενοκρίτος ὁ Λοκρὸς, καὶ Πολύμηστος ὁ Κολοφώνιος, καὶ Σακάδας ὁ Ἀργεῖος, μάλιστα αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν ἡγεμόνες γενέσθαι. τούτων γὰρ εἰσηγησαμένων τὰ περὶ τὰς γυμνοπαιδίας τὰς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, λέγεται καταστήναι τὰ περὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις τὰς ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ, τῶν τε ἐν Ἀργεῖ τὰ ἐνδυμάτια καλούμενα. Of the names here mentioned in connection with the *Γυμνοπαιδία*, that of Thadetas, of Gortyna, might have been that of a contemporary of the institution, B. C. 664, cf. capp. x. and xlii. Sacadas, of Argos, last mentioned, was older than Pindar, cap. viii. and as it appears from Pausanias, won the first prize with the αἰλός, at the Pythian games, Olymp. xlvi. 3. B. C. 586, and two more victories in succession, B. C. 582 and B. C. 578. Pausanias, ii. xxii. 4: vi. xiv. 4: x. vii. 3.

<sup>v</sup> Pausanias, iii. xi. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Thesaurus Temporum, Jerome,

<sup>x</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ad in Chronico, ad Ann. 1347. Ol. xxvii. 3. Ann. 1351. Olymp. xxviii. 4.

<sup>a</sup> See supra, page 452.

<sup>y</sup> Syncellus, 401. 20.

In one of the preceding passages, the *Gymnopædiæ* are spoken of as if they made part of the Carnean solemnity; but the true meaning of that statement is simply that a chorus of naked boys, singing a *pæan*, had something to do with the ceremonial of the *Carnea* also, which in itself was very possible. We observe too that, in several of these testimonies, the subject of the songs at the *Γυμνοπαίδιαι* is said to have been the praises of those who fell at *Thyrea*; which does not necessarily imply that the *Γυμνοπαίδιαι* were instituted in commemoration of that battle, but it may very possibly do that the anniversary of this battle, and the *Γυμνοπαίδιαι*, fell out together, as *Leuctra* and they did, B. C. 371. Eusebius dates the year of *Thyrea*, Olymp. xv. 3, B. C. 718<sup>b</sup>; Jerome, Olymp. xiv. 4, B. C. 720<sup>c</sup>; Solinus<sup>d</sup>, in the 17th year of Romulus, B. C. 736. Mr. Clinton has adopted Eusebius' date; but Jerome's has *this* to recommend it, that it coincided with Cycle v. 1. of Type iii. of the Amyclæan *Ennead*, when the date of the *Gymnopædiæ*, if then in existence, would have been the same as B. C. 664, (our assumed date of their actual institution,) July 23. And if *Thyrea* was actually fought July 23, B. C. 720, that might be the reason why July 23, B. C. 664, was fixed upon as the date of the *Γυμνοπαίδιαι*, or at least why the praises of those who fell at *Thyrea*, July 23, B. C. 720, should have been made the subject of the songs at the *Γυμνοπαίδιαι*, instituted July 23, B. C. 664. Pausanias dates the battle of *Thyrea* after the first Messenian war, consequently later than B. C. 723, yet still in the reign of *Theopompus*<sup>e</sup>; which, if true, would be strong presumptive argument that it could not have been much later than B. C. 723.

We are told by Herodotus<sup>f</sup>, that the *Gymnopædiæ* were going on at Sparta when *Leotychidas* put the affront on *Demaratus*, (the lately deposed king,) which led to his voluntary expatriation of himself, and retirement to Persia. The year of this occurrence is uncertain. Mr. Clinton assumes it about two years before the death of *Darius*, B. C. 488, Cycle xiv. 1. of the *Octaëteric* correction of the time being, when the

<sup>b</sup> Chron. Arm. Lat. ad Ann. 1298.<sup>c</sup> Thes. Temporum, ad Ann. 1296.<sup>d</sup> vii. 8.<sup>e</sup> iii. vii. 5.<sup>f</sup> vi. 67-70.

Gymnopædiæ would be in course on the 10th of the lunar Hecatombeus, the 29th of the solar, August 12.

The case of the *Γυμνοπαιδία* mentioned by Thucydides §, B. C. 417, proves that this observance was not so necessarily restricted to its own month, and its own days of the month, but that it could be put off, if there was a sufficient reason why it should be, to a different month, or period of the same month. This year, in the regular course of things, they were in course before the end of Thucydides' chronological summer at least—that is, the autumnal equinox, B. C. 417: and by the Spartan calendar of the time being Hecatombeus 10 fell July 6.

§ v. 82. cf. 81.

## DISSERTATION XI.

*On the Cronia or Olympia of Hellenic Antiquity; on the Cronian Calendar of Pelops; and on the Olympic and the Civil Calendar respectively of Elis.*

---

### CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—*On the relative antiquity and order of the principal Games of the Greeks.*

THE number of Games which once existed among the Greeks was so considerable, and so much out of proportion to reason or fitness, that even to make out the list of their names would be almost an endless task; much more to investigate the history of each, the date of its institution, the nature of its rule or cycle, and the like. By far the greatest part however of these institutions, so characteristic of the ancient Greeks, were founded in comparatively later times, and in imitation of older and preexisting ones of the same kind. The most ancient among them were comparatively few, and the most ancient were of course the most illustrious and most esteemed; especially those which, by way of distinction, were called the Period—the Olympic, the Pythian, the Nemean, and the Isthmian. We propose, with the Divine blessing upon our undertaking, to treat of these four in as many Dissertations; and though, with respect to so important a preliminary to the consideration of any one of them as the true date of its institution, nothing can be taken for granted at present which is to be determined by actual inquiry hereafter, yet it may not be amiss to begin with premising some testimonies, from which the reader may judge of the opinions of the Greeks themselves in general respecting the relative order and antiquity of the most remarkable of this class of their national institutions.



i. Ἡ τάξις τῶν ἀγῶνων κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλην γράφεται πρῶτα μὲν τὰ Ἐλευσίαια, διὰ τὸν καρπὸν τῆς Δήμητρος· δεύτερον δὲ τὰ Παναθήναια ἐπὶ Ἄσπερι τῷ γίγαντι, ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἀναιρεθέντι τρίτος ὃν ἐν Ἄργει Δαναὸς ἔθηκε διὰ τὸν γάμον τῶν θυγατέρων αὐτοῦ· τέταρτος ὁ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τεθείς ὑπὸ Λυκάου, ὃς ἐκλήθη Λύκαια· πέμπτος ὁ ἐν Ἰολκῷ, Ἰακάστου (Ἀκάστου) καθηγησαμένου ἐπὶ Πελία τῷ πατρὶ. ἕκτος ὁ ἐν Ἰσθμῷ, Σισύφου νομοθετήσαντος, ἐπὶ Μελικέρτῃ· ἑβδομος ὁ Ὀλυμπιακός, Ἡρακλέους νομοθετήσαντος, ἐπὶ Πέλοπι· ὄγδοος ὁ ἐν Νεμέᾳ, ὃν ἔθηκαν οἱ ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας, ἐπὶ Ἀρχεμόρφ· ἔνατος ὁ ἐν Τροίᾳ, ὃν Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ ἐποίησε· δέκατος ὁ Πυθικός, ὃν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνος φόνῳ ἔθηκαν. ταύτην τὴν τάξιν εἰς Πέπλους\* συνθεῖς ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐξέθετο τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ παλαιῶν ἀγῶνων<sup>h</sup>—ii. Ὅτι πρῶτα μὲν τὰ Παναθήναια συνέστη· εἶτα τὰ Ἐλευσίαια (εἶτα ἱ) ἐπὶ Πελία τεθηγκότι προὔθηκον ἄλλα Θετταλοί· εἶτα τὰ Ἰσθμια. ἐπὶ Μελικέρτῃ· ἔπειτα ὁ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἀγὼν ἀρχὴν λαμβάνει ὑφ' Ἡρακλέος· εἶτα τὰ Νέμεα, ἐπὶ Ἀρχεμόρφ τεθέντα· εἶτα μετὰ τὸ τὴν Κίρραν πεσεῖν τὰ Πύθια<sup>i</sup>.

iii. Qui primi Ludos fecerunt<sup>k</sup>... quinto loco Argis quos fecit Danaus Beli filius filiarum nuptiis... sexto autem iterum Argis, quos fecit Lynceus Ægypti filius Junoni Argivæ, qui appellantur Ἀσπισεαργῶες (corrigere Ἀσπὶς ἐν Ἄργει, or

\* It is clear from this remark that this Scholiast must have considered Aristotle the author of the *Pepli* or *Peplus*: though that is a disputed point with the learned at present. Proclus and Tzetzes would seem to have doubted of it<sup>1</sup>: Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ ὁ φιλόσοφος, μᾶλλον δὲ οἶμαι ὁ τοὺς Πέπλους συντάξας: but Porphyry, a better authority than either, did not hesitate to ascribe it to Aristotle<sup>2</sup>: Ἱστορεῖ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Πορφύριος καὶ ὅτι Ἀριστοτέλης σύγγραμμα πραγματευσάμενος, ὑπερ ἐκλήθη Πέπλος, γενεαλογίας τε ἡγεμόνων ἐξέθετο, καὶ νεῶν ἐκάστων ἀριθμὸν, καὶ ἐπιγράμματα εἰς αὐτοὺς, ἃ καὶ ἀναγράφεται ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς ἐς τὸν Ὀμηρον<sup>3</sup>, κ', τ. λ. These epigrams, attributed to Aristotle, on the worthies of Troy, are still extant<sup>3</sup>. Whosoever was the author of this work, he seems to have given it the title of Πέπλος, or Πέπλοι, because of its miscellaneous character, or the variety of subjects of which it treated. A similar work, ascribed to Africanus, in 14 books, was entitled *Κεστοί*. The *Στρωματεῖς* of Clemens Alexandrinus come under the same category.

<sup>h</sup> Scholia in Aristidem, iii. 323. 8=189. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Phot. Bibl. Codex 279. 533. 29-34. Chrestomathie of Helladius.

<sup>k</sup> Hyginus Fabb. cclxxiii.

<sup>1</sup> Schol. in Hesiod. pag. 7 and 15.      <sup>2</sup> Eustathius ad Iliad. B. 557. 285. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Anthologia, i. iii: Aristoteles, iii.

Ἄσπιεναργῶα<sup>1</sup>) ... septimo autem loco Perseus Jovis et Danaë's filius funebres Polydectæ ... octavo loco fecit Hercules Olympiæ gymnicos Pelopi Tantali filio ... nono loco facti sunt in Nemea Archemoro ... quos fecerunt septem duces qui Thebas ibant obpugnatum ... decimo Isthmia Melicertæ ... fecisse dicitur Eratocles, alii poëtæ dicunt Theseum. undecimo fecerunt Argonautæ ... Cyzico regi. duodecimo ... Argivis (Achivis) quos fecit Acastus Pelei (Pelîæ) filius ... tertio decimo fecit in Ilio Priamus, cenotaphium Paridi quem natum jusserat interfici ... quartodecimo Achilles Patroclo funebres ... quintodecimo fecit Æneas ... in Sicilia &c.—iv. Ludos gymnicos in Arcadia Lycaon: funebres Acastus Iolco: post eum Theseus in Isthmo: Hercules Olympiæ athleticam<sup>m</sup>.

According to these statements, which are substantially to the same effect, and especially according to the first, the order in which these games came into being was as follows.

- i The Ἐλευσίνια.
- ii The Παναθήναια.
- iii Ὅν ἐν Ἄργει Δαναὸς κ', τ. λ.
- iv The Λύκαια.
- v Ὅ ἐν Ἰολκῶ κ', τ. λ.
- vi The Ἰσθμία.
- vii The Ὀλύμπια.
- viii The Νέμεα.
- ix Ὅ ἐν Τροίᾳ ἐπὶ Πατρόκλω κ', τ. λ.
- x The Πύθια.

It is obvious to remark however that these were not all instances of the foundation of games in the same sense of the term; i. e. of solemnities instituted in the first instance for a particular end and purpose, and repeated ever after, according to some proper rule, for the same. This might have been true of every other case here enumerated, but it could not have been so, as far as we know, of the *third*, the games of Danaus, the *fifth*, those of Acastus, or the *ninth*, those of Achilles at Troy: none of which were ever repeated. The games of Danaus at the marriage of his daughters are alluded to by Pindar, as historical<sup>n</sup>; those of Achilles at the funeral of Patroclus are attested by Homer<sup>o</sup>; those of Acastus, at the funeral solemnities of Pelias, were represented

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fabb. clxx.

<sup>m</sup> Pliny, H. N. vii. 57. 295.

<sup>n</sup> Pythia, ix. 194 sqq.

<sup>o</sup> Iliad. Ψ. 257 sqq.

on the ark of Kypselus<sup>p</sup>, and appear to have been celebrated by Stesichorus<sup>q</sup>. But none of these is known to have had a cycle of its own, and to have been celebrated accordingly.

The final end of the preceding enumeration must have been simply to place on record the most remarkable instances of games, actually celebrated on such and such occasions, or believed to have been so, and in their order relatively to each other, as handed down by tradition, whether they were repeated or not. And though no dates are assigned them in the preceding statements, that omission might be supplied to a certain extent from the Parian Chronicle; in which the arrival of Danaus at Argos, which could not long have preceded the marriage of his daughters, is dated under Epocha ix, B. C. 1511; the Panathenæa under Epocha x, B. C. 1506; the Eleusinia and Lykæa both under Epocha xvii; the Isthmia under Epocha xxi, B. C. 1259; the Nemea under Epocha xxiii, B. C. 1251; the Pythia, as founded by the Amphictyons for the first time, under Epocha xxxviii, B. C. 591, and as founded the second time, under Epocha xxxix, B. C. 582.

It must be inferred indeed from the concurrence of these testimonies that the Greeks supposed the oldest of these institutions to have been the Eleusinia and the Panathenæa<sup>r</sup>; though with respect to the comparative antiquity of those two opinions appear to have differed. The author of the Pepli must have thought the Eleusinian the older; probably because they commemorated the first gift of bread-corn, than which nothing could have been more ancient, because nothing could have been more indispensable to the existence of society itself. And yet, as we ourselves have shewn<sup>s</sup>, if the Athenæa of Erichthonius were accompanied by the institution of games also, these must have been several years older than anything of the same kind which could have arisen out of the institution of the Eleusinia. The dates of these several occasions, regarded as the foundation of games properly so called, (i. e. of permanent institutions,) which our own investigations have already determined

<sup>p</sup> Pausanias, v. xvii. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Athenæus, iv. 72. cf. Apoll. Rhod.

i. 5: Plutarch, Symposium, v. 2.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. Aristides, xiii. Panath. i. 308. 2: also supra, vol. iv. 117.

<sup>s</sup> Vol. iv. 261 sqq.

or may do so hereafter, briefly stated in their chronological order, are as follows.

		B. C.
i	The Ἀθήναια of Erichthonius or Erechtheus	1342
ii	The Ἐλευσίνια of Eumolpus .. ..	1310
iii	The Κρόνια (or Ὀλύμπια) of Pelops .. ..	1264
iv	The Λύκαια of Lykæon .. ..	1260
v	The Ἴσθμια of the Actoridæ .. ..	1248
vi	The Ὀλύμπια of Hercules .. ..	1240
vii	The Ἴσθμια of Theseus .. ..	1228
viii	The Νέμεα of the Seven .. ..	1222
ix	The Πύθια of Philammon .. ..	1222
x	The Παναθηναία of Theseus .. ..	1206
xi	The Πύθια of the Amphictyons .. ..	582

And this may serve to explain the position of the Ὀλύμπια on the list, according to the Peplus; in which, though actually older than the Isthmia, which descended to posterity, (the Isthmia of Theseus,) they are placed after them. These Olympia however were those of Hercules; and those were really later than the Isthmia of the Actoridæ, the fifth on our list; the first institution of their kind. The place assigned in the Peplus also to the Pythia is a proof that in the opinion of the author they were the latest of all; and consequently that he must have thought, with the compiler of the Parian Chronicle, that these games were to be dated only from the reduction of Kirrha by the Amphictyons. And that might be true of the quadriennial Pythia; but could not have been so of the octennial, which went as far back as the institution of the Pythian Eumæad, and were only three months later than the Nemea, which in point of absolute antiquity came next to the Isthmia of Theseus.

SECTION II.—*On the Games of the Period, properly so called.*

i. Number, Names, and respective Authors of the Games of the Period.

Τέσσαρες εἰσιν ἀγῶνες ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, τέσσαρες ἱροί:  
οἱ δύο μὲν θνητῶν, οἱ δύο δ' ἀθανάτων  
Ζηνὸς, Δηιοῦδαο, Παλαίμονος, Ἀρχεμόρου  
ἄθλα δὲ τῶν κότινος μῆλα σέλινα πίτυς ὕ.

<sup>c</sup> Anthologia Græca, iv. 214. Ἀδέσποτα, CCCCLIII. cf. Ausonius, Eclogiæ, 386.

The author of this epigram is unknown; but its antiquity cannot be called in question. It plainly appears from it that, numerous as the games of the Greeks might be, there were only *four* to which the name of *ιεροὶ* or *sacred* was supposed to belong; the Olympia, the Pythia, the Isthmia, and the Nemea. The same designation is applied to these absolutely by Plutarch<sup>v</sup>, and by Pollux<sup>x</sup>. And hence the conquerors in these were distinguished by a title peculiar to themselves, that of *ιεροίκαί*. The round of these games in succession was called the *Περίοδος*; and the games themselves the *Περιοδικοί*: an enlarged sense and application of the term for the proper cycle of each, which was originally, as we hope to see hereafter, the same in them all, a cycle of four years. though, in the case of two of them, in the course of time it came to be one of two years. *Perihodos*: ... in gymniciis certaminibus perihodon vicisse dicitur qui Pythia, Isthmia, Nemea, Olympia vicit: a circumitu eorum spectaculorum<sup>y</sup>—*Συντάττειτο δ' ἂν τούτοις καὶ αἱ τῆς Περιόδου (ἑορταί), καὶ τῶν ἀγῶνων κλήσεις, Ὀλύμπια καὶ τὰ λοιπά<sup>z</sup>.*

It may be inferred too from the order of the above enumeration, that the Olympia must have been reckoned the oldest of these games of the Period; which was, in fact, the case. And indeed it may be generally observed that in all allusions of this kind the Olympia are placed at the head, partly as the oldest, and partly, if not principally, because they were dedicated to Jupiter, the greatest of the gods; and next to them the Pythia, as sacred to Apollo, the next of the gods in estimation and dignity. The Isthmia and the Nemea were both placed last, because they were dedicated, in the first instance at least, to the memory of mortals, not to some of the gods.

---

Prima Jovi magno celebrantur Olympia Pisæ.  
Parnassus Clario sacravit Pythia Phæbo.  
Isthmia Portuno bimaribus dicat acta Corinthi.  
Archemori Nemeæa colunt funebria Thebæ<sup>a</sup>.

---

Primus Olympiacæ sacravit festa coronæ  
Jupiter Argivi stadia ad longissima Circi.

<sup>v</sup> Timoleon, xxiii.

<sup>z</sup> Pollux, i. i. 32.

<sup>x</sup> iii. xxx. 8.

<sup>a</sup> Ausonius, Eclogæ, 387, De Ludis.

<sup>y</sup> Festus, xiv. 338. 6.

Proximus Alcides Nemeæ sacra vitæ honorem.  
 Hæc quoque temporibus quinquennia sacra notandis.  
 Isthmia Neptuno data sunt et Pythia Phæbo,  
 Ancipiti cultu divorum hominumque sepultis <sup>b</sup>.

Tantalidæ Pelopi mæstum dicat Elis honorem.  
 Archemori Nemeæa colunt quinquennia Thebæ.  
 Isthmia defuncto celebrata Palæmone notum.  
 Pythia placando Delphi statuere draconi <sup>c</sup>.

Jam placidæ dant signa tubæ, jam fortibus ardens  
 Fumat arena sacris : hos nec Pisæus honores  
 Juppiter, aut Cyrrhæ pater adspernetur opacæ.  
 Nil his triste locis ; cedat lacrimabilis Isthmos,  
 Cedat atrox Nemeæ : litat hic felicior infans <sup>d</sup>.

Grajum ex more decus : primus Pisæa per arva  
 Hunc pius Alcides Pelopi certavit honorem,  
 Pulveremque fera crinem detersit oliva.  
 Proxima vipereo celebravit libera nexu  
 Phocis Apollinæ bellum puerile pharetræ.  
 Mox circum tristes servata Palæmonis aras  
 Nigra superstitio, quoties animosa resumit  
 Leucothoë gemitus et amica ad litora festa  
 Tempestate venit : planctu conclamat uterque  
 Isthmos, Echioniæ responsant flebile Thebæ.  
 Et nunc eximii regum <sup>e</sup>, &c.

Clemens Alexandrinus, among the games which were in existence in his time, mentions only these four ; though in an inverted order <sup>f</sup> : "Ἰθι δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐν βραχεῖ περιόδουσιν, καὶ τὰς ἐπιτυμβίους ταυτασὶ πανηγύρεις καταλύσωμεν, Ἰσθμιά τε καὶ Νέμεα καὶ Πύθια καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις Ὀλύμπια <sup>g</sup>."

The estimation in which these four were held was proportionable to their supposed antiquity and sacredness above all others—the Olympia standing at the head of all, the Pythia next to them, and then the Isthmia and the Nemea, or the Nemea and the Isthmia. Success in any of these four, especially in the Olympia, was the highest object of Grecian am-

<sup>b</sup> Ausonius, Eclogæ, 388. De Auctoribus.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 589.

<sup>d</sup> Statius, Sylvæ, iii. i. 139. De Ludis Herculis Surrentini a Pollio Felice institutis. cf. i sqq. : 43-45.

<sup>e</sup> Thebais, vi. 5. of the institution

of the Nemean games. cf. vi. 1-4 : vii. 91-97.

<sup>f</sup> Protrepticon, ii. § 34. pag. 29. l. 5.  
<sup>g</sup> Cf. Ibid. 8-16 : Eusebius, Præparatio, ii. 6. 158. § 10 : Tertullian, iv. 122 : De Spectaculis, 11 : 360. De Corona Militis, 13.

bition, and the greatest distinction which could be obtained among the ancient Greeks. Sed quid hos, says Cicero<sup>h</sup>, quibus Olympiorum victoria consulatus ille antiquus videtur—And again<sup>i</sup>; Quid si etiam occisus est a piratis Adramitenus ... Atinas pugil, Olympionices? hoc est apud Græcos, quoniam de eorum gravitate dicimus, prope majus et gloriosius quam Romæ triumphasse. The statues of these victors were erected at the public expense; and of those who had conquered a certain number of times, the exact effigies or likeness—statues which expressed their stature, figure, and shape to the life<sup>k</sup>: Effigies hominum non solebant exprimi, nisi aliqua illustri causa perpetuitatem merentium, primo sacrorum certaminum victoria, maximeque Olympiæ: ubi omnium, qui vicissent, statuas dicari mos erat, eorum vero, qui ter ibi superavissent, ex membris ipsorum similitudine expressa, quas iconicas (εικονικούς) vocant—'Ακούω. ἔφη<sup>l</sup>, πολλῶν λεγόντων, εἰ δὲ ἀληθὲς ὑμεῖς οἱ ἄνδρες ἴστε, μηδ' Ὀλυμπιάσιν ἐξεῖναι τοῖς νικῶσι μείζους τῶν σωμάτων ἀνεστάναι τοὺς ἀνδριάντας, ἀλλ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἑλληνοδίκας ὅπως μηδὲ εἰς ὑπερβάλῃται τὴν ἀλήθειαν: and allusions to such exact representations of the persons of these victors are still found on record<sup>m</sup>.

The conquerors in these games received pensions also from their respective communities, for the rest of their lives—Τῶ δ' Ἰσθμια νικήσαντι δραχμὰς ἑταξεν ἑκατὸν δίδοσθαι, τῶ δ' Ὀλύμπια πεντακοσίας<sup>n</sup>—and when they returned home, after gaining the crown on such occasions, not the least remarkable of the distinctions awarded them was the privilege of the *Εἰσέλασις*, i. e. their entering into their respective cities not as usual through the gates, but through the walls; part of which was taken down on purpose to admit them—the meaning of this part of the ceremony being that cities, which had such brave defenders, stood in no need of walls for their protection<sup>o</sup>. And from this circumstance too these games, as

<sup>h</sup> Tusculanæ, ii. 17, 41.

<sup>i</sup> Oratio xxiv. Pro L. Flacco, 13, 31. cf. Tacitus, De Oratore, 10: Quinctilian, ii. 8, 7.

<sup>k</sup> Pliny, H. N. xxxiv. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Lucian, ii. 490, Imagines, 11. cf. Suetonius, Nero, xxiv. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Schol. in Pindar. ad Olymp. vii. Pausanias, Elaca.

<sup>n</sup> Plutarch, Solon, xxiii. cf. Aristides,

xxvii: Dio, lii. 30. (U. C. 725. B. C. 29. -cf. liii.): Suetonius, Augustus, xxiv. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Cf. Plut. Sympos. ii. v. 2: Καὶ τὸ τοῖς νικηφόροις εἰσελαύνουσι τῶν τειχῶν ἐφίεσθαι μέρος διελεῖν καὶ καταβάλλειν, τοιαύτην ἔχει διάνοιαν, ὡς οὐ μέγα πόλει τειχῶν ὕψελος ἄνδρας ἐχούση μάχεσθαι δυναμένους καὶ νικᾶν.

conferring this privilege on the victors, were called εἰσελαστικοὶ as well as ἱεροί—Additæ leges arctæ...quasque conferre libeat cum illa Græcorum summa (corona) quæ sub ipso Jove datur, cuique muros patria gaudens rumpit<sup>o</sup>—Ἀθλητῶν δὲ τοῖς μὲν τὰ βαρέα καὶ μεγάλα ἀσκούσιν ἀγαθὸν ἂν εἴη καὶ νικηφόρον· εἰσελάσουσι γάρ...εἰσελεύνειν δὲ εἰς πόλιν ἀγαθὸν ἀθλητῆ καὶ νοσοῦντι· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἱερονίκης ἔσται, ὁ δὲ οὐ τεθνήξεται<sup>ν</sup>—

Οἶον δὴ βασιλῆα φερέπτολιν, ἧέ τιν' ἄνδρα  
ἀθλοφόρον, θαλλοῖσι νεοδρέπτοισι κομῶντα,  
παῖδες τ' ἠΐθεοί τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἀμφινέμοντες  
ὄν δόμον εἰσανάγουσι, καὶ ἀθροοὶ αἰὲν ἔπονται,  
εἰσόκεν εὐερκῆ μεγάρων ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἀμείψῃ<sup>η</sup>.

Nobilibus athleticis qui Olympia Pythia Isthmia Nemea vicissent Græcorum majores ita magnos honores constituerunt, uti non modo in conventu stantes cum palma et corona ferant laudes, sed etiam cum revertantur in suas civitates cum victoria triumphantes quadrigis in mœnia et in patrias invehantur, e reque publica perpetua vita constitutis vectigalibus fruuntur<sup>r</sup>. Thus Diodorus<sup>s</sup> describes the triumphal reception of Exænetus, of Agrigentum, into his native city, after his victory in the Stade, Olymp. xcii. B. C. 412; and Ælian<sup>t</sup> relates an anecdote of one of these victors, a contemporary of Diogenes, which occurred at the time of his εἰσέλασις into Athens: Διώξιππος Ὀλυμπιονίκης ἀθλητῆς ὁ Ἀθηναῖος εἰσήλαυνεν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας κατὰ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἀθλητῶν κ', τ. λ. And in this manner did Nero also, after his return from Greece, A. D. 67, celebrate his pretended victories in the games<sup>v</sup>: Reversus e Græcia, Neapolim quod in ea primam artem protulerat<sup>x</sup> albis equis introiit, disjecta parte muri, ut mos hieronicarum est. simili modo Antium, inde Albanum, inde Romam<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Pliny, H. N. xvi. 5. 280.

<sup>p</sup> Artemidorus, Oneirocritica, i. 58. (cf. i. 2.)

<sup>q</sup> Oppian, Halieutica, i. 197.

<sup>r</sup> Vitruvius, ix. Præfatio. A pension was still paid to the victors in these Iselastic games in the time of the Roman emperors, though the number of such games had then become much greater than it was originally. See the correspondence on this subject between

Pliny the younger and the emperor Trajan, when the former was governor of Bithynia: Epp. x. 119, 120. Cf. also our Exposition of the Parables, vol. v. Part ii. Appendix, 209 and note.

<sup>s</sup> xiii. 83. cf. 68.

<sup>t</sup> Variæ, xii. 58.

<sup>v</sup> Suetonius, Nero, xxv. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. xx. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Cf. xxiv. 1: liii. 4: Dio, lxiii. 20,



## ii. Prizes at the Games of the Period.

The prizes at the games of the Greeks having been different at different times, the games themselves had different names according to the difference of these prizes. Τοὺς μὲν οὖν καλουμένους ἱεροὺς ἀγῶνας, ὧν τὰ ἄθλα ἐν στεφάνῳ μόνῳ, στεφανίτας ἐκάλεσαν καὶ φυλλίνας· τοὺς δὲ ὀνομαζομένους θεματικούς ἀργυρίτας<sup>z</sup>—Τοὺς στεφανίτας<sup>a</sup>· τοὺς ἐποδικούς, (corr. περιοδικούς) καλουμένους λέγει· οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀγῶνων εἰσὶ στεφανίται οἱ δὲ ἀργυρίται. δίδονται γοῦν μέγιστα δωρεὰ καὶ μετὰ τὸν στέφανον—Φυλλίται οἱ στεφανίται, δωρίται οἱ θέματα διδόντες, ἀργυρίται οἱ ἔχοντες χρυσᾶ ἄθλα<sup>b</sup>. This distinction is observable in the account of the institution of the Pythian games, according to the Parian Marble; the ἀγὼν being described at first as ἀργυρίτης, because the prize was awarded out of the spoils of Kirrha, and at the second institution, when the prize was changed into a simple wreath, as στεφανίτης. Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>c</sup> traces these successive changes in the kinds of prizes at the games, as follows: Ἐν (δὲ) τοῖς ἀγῶσι πρῶτον ἡ τῶν ἀθλητῶν δόσις ἦν—i. e. rewards given by those at whose expense the games were exhibited, such as the games of Achilles, at the death of Patroclus, or those of Æneas, in memory of Anchises; δεύτερον δὲ ὁ ἐπαγερμός—i. e. voluntary contributions from the spectators; τρίτον ἡ φυλλοβολία, chaplets, made of such materials as first came to hand, and extemporized for the occasion, but voluntary also; τελευταῖον ὁ στέφανος, the crown properly so called, proposed and bestowed by the ἀθλοθέται of later times, such as the olive crown at the Olympia, by the Hellanodikæ, the laurel crown at the Pythia, by the Amphictyons, and the like, ἐπίδοσιν λαβούσης εἰς τρυφήν τῆς Ἑλλάδος μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά. The Scholia on the Hecuba too quote a passage from Eratosthenes, which illustrates the substitution of the φυλλοβολία for the δόσις or the ἐπαγερμός<sup>d</sup>: Ἐὼς μὲν οὖν ἐν ἀγώνισμα κατὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν ἦν, (no doubt, the first or original one of the stade, or footrace<sup>e</sup>,) δαψιλῆς ἐγίνετο

<sup>z</sup> Pollux, iii. xxx. 8.<sup>a</sup> Ulpian, Schol. in Demosth. 185. adv. Leptinen, 503. 5.<sup>b</sup> Schol. in Pind. ad Olymp. viii. 101.<sup>c</sup> Pædagogus, ii. viii. § 72. pag. 236

l. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Hecub. 569.<sup>e</sup> Cf. Schol. in Pind. ad Olymp. i. 154: Plato, iii. iii. 84. 11. De Legg. viii.

ἡ τῶν δωρεῶν δόσις· πολλαπλασιαζομένους δὲ τούτους...τέλος ἡ φυλλοβολία κατελείφθη<sup>f</sup>. We may easily conceive how necessary this substitution of some cheaper mode of rewarding the victors in such contests, for the original but more expensive one of presents, would become, when we consider the number of the ἀγωνίσματα to which the Olympic games alone in the course of time came to amount. Στεφάνους ἔχει κη', says one Scholiast of antiquity<sup>g</sup>, ἀγωνίσματα ιζ', says another<sup>h</sup>. The ordinary number at these games was not less than eight; and at the 177th Olympia of the list of Phlegon, B. C. 72<sup>k</sup>, twenty victories at least are enumerated, each of which of course had its proper prize. And though the φυλλοβολία, or chaplets made by the spectators for the occasion, in course of time was superseded by the στέφανος, yet *teniae* and *vittae*, ribbons and fillets, and no doubt leaves and flowers, as the spontaneous expression of the sympathy of the spectators with the conquerors, over and above the crown adjudged them by the umpires, were commonly thrown upon them, down to the latest times<sup>l</sup>.

According to Pausanias<sup>m</sup>, the common material of the crown, in most of the contests of his own time, was the leaves of the palm. The hand of the victor at least was decorated with a branch of palm, whatsoever the crown which encircled his head; Ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ, which serves to illustrate the observation of Vitruvius supra: and Pausanias traces this custom up to the time of Theseus' return from Crete, after, according to the popular tradition, he celebrated games to Apollo at Delos, and crowned the victors from the palm-tree there. The crown at the Olympia however was made of olive leaves; that of the Pythia of laurel leaves, or apples; that of the Nemea of parsley; that of the Isthmia, at first, of the leaves of the pine, afterwards of parsley, like that of the Nemea, but with this difference, that the Isthmian crown was made of dry parsley, the Nemean one of green<sup>n</sup>: Ὀλυμπίασι μὲν στέφανος

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Suidas, Περιαιγερόμενοι: Etym. M. Κότινος.

<sup>g</sup> Ad Pind. Olymp. v. 14.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Cf. Paroemiographi Græci, Zenob. Centur. v. 78. 368: 95. E. Cod. Bodl. 774: Πάντα δικτῶ: Schol. ad Aves, 293.

<sup>k</sup> Phot. Bibl. Cod. 197.

<sup>l</sup> Cf. Dio Chrys. ix. 292. 5. also our Prolegomena ad Harmoniam Evangelicam, cap. iii. 155 n.

<sup>m</sup> viii. xlvi. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Lucian, ii. 888. De Gymnasiis, 90. 9.

ἐκ κοτίνου, Ἰσθμοὶ δὲ ἐκ πίτυος, ἐν Νεμέᾳ δὲ σελίων πεπλεγμένους, Πυθοῦ δὲ μῆλων τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>1</sup>—Τὰ γὰρ ἄθλά οἱ καὶ κλεινὰ καὶ ἦν καὶ ἐδόκει, κότινος Ὀλυμπικός, καὶ Ἰσθμικὴ πίτυς, καὶ δάφνη Πυθική<sup>2</sup>—

Sit pronum vicisse domi: quid Achæa mereri  
Præmia, nunc ramis Phæbi, nunc germine Lernæ,  
Nunc Athamantea protectum tempora pinu<sup>3</sup>?

Quid enim velocis gloria plantæ  
Præstet, et esuriens Pisææ ramus olivæ<sup>4</sup>?

Οὐ κότινος Ὀλυμπικός, οὔτε μῆλα Δελφικὰ παίγνια, οὔδὲ Ἰσθμικὴ πίτυς, οὔδὲ Νεμαίας σέλινα<sup>5</sup>—Σύμβολον στέμμα τῶν ἱερῶν ἀγῶνι, οἷον Ὀλυμπίων κότινος, Πυθίων δάφνη, Νεμείων σέλινον χλωρόν, Ἰσθμίων σέλινον ξηρόν<sup>6</sup>.

Of the Olympic crown in particular, it is to be observed that a very common name for it appears to have been κότινος, in the sense however not of the crown itself, so much as of the material of which it was made; the wild olive—κότινος in Greek, oleaster in Latin—Κότινος<sup>7</sup> ἀγριέλαιος, ἣ ὁ ἐξ ἀγριελαιίας στέφανος Ὀλυμπιακός. φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν κότινον εἶναι—Κότινος<sup>8</sup> ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς στέφανος—Athenæ quoque victores olea coronant. Greci vero oleastro Olympiæ<sup>9</sup>—Olympiæ oleaster (conspicitur,) ex quo primus Hercules coronatus est, et nunc custoditur religiose<sup>10</sup>. But its most proper name was Καλλιστῶ, or Καλλιστέφανος—Ἀγροῦσι δὲ ὅτι οὗτος (scil. ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς στέφανος) ἐκ τῆς καλλιστοῦς ἢ καλλιστεφάνου ἐλαιίας γενόμενος δίδοται, ἥτις ἀπέχει σταδίων ὑκτῶ, ὡς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης<sup>11</sup>—Ἢ δὲ ἱερὰ ἐλαία μορία ἢ δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ καλλιστέφανος<sup>12</sup>—Ὀλύμπια... ἐν οἷς κοτίνου στέφανος ἄθλον ἐδίδοτο τῷ νικήσαντι. τιτὲς δ' οὐ κότινον, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς λεγομένης καλλιστεφάνου ἐλαιίας. διαφέρει δὲ κότινον ἐλαϊκὸν ἀγριελαιίας<sup>13</sup>. There is a locus clas-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Herod. viii. 26: Dio Chrys. viii. 280. 5: Ixxv. 408. 10: Maximus Tyrius, vii. 4. pag. 67: v. 8. 49: Dio, lxiii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Ælian, De Natura Anim. vi. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Statius, Silvæ, v. iii. 141.

<sup>4</sup> Juvenal, xiii. 98.

<sup>5</sup> Gregory of Nazianz. Opp. i. 450 C. xxiv. 19. (cf. Basil, Opp. ii. 180 D. De legendis Libb. Gentilium, 6.

<sup>6</sup> Scholia in Pind. ad Olymp. iii. 27. cf. ad 19-24: 31, 32: iv. 19, 20: xiii.

<sup>7</sup> Nemea, iv. 138-143: vi. 71, 72: Isthm. ii. 20-23: viii. 136.

<sup>8</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>9</sup> Etym. M.

<sup>10</sup> Pliny, H. N. xv. 5. 154.

<sup>11</sup> xvi. 89.

<sup>12</sup> Schol. in Theocrit. Idyll. iv. 7.

<sup>13</sup> Pollux, i. xii. 14. cf. Schol. ad Olymp. viii. 1.

<sup>14</sup> Scholia in Platon. ii. 313: In Phædrum, 20. 1.

sicus in reference to this tree, in the work *De Mirabilibus*, attributed to Aristotle<sup>d</sup>. 'Εν τῷ Παρθείῳ ἐστὶν ἐλαία, καλεῖται δὲ καλλιστέφανος. ταύτης πάντα τὰ φύλλα ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐλαίαις ἐναντία πέφυκεν· ἔξω γὰρ ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐντὸς ἔχει τὰ χλωρά· ἀφήσιν τε τοὺς πτόρθους ὡσπερ ἡ μύρτος εἰς τοὺς στεφάνους συμμέτρως. ἀπὸ ταύτης φυτὸν λαβὼν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐφύτευσεν Ὀλυμπίασιν, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ στέφανοι τοῖς ἀθληταῖς δίδονται. ἐστὶ δὲ αὕτη παρὰ τὸν Ἴλισσον ποταμὸν (in Attica), σταδίους ἐξήκοντα τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀπέχουσα· περιφκοδόμεται δὲ, καὶ ζημία μεγάλη τῷ θιγόντι αὐτῆς ἐστίν. ἀπὸ ταύτης δὲ τὸ φυτὸν λαβόντες ἐφύτευσαν Ἡλεῖοι ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους ἀπ' αὐτῆς ἔδωκαν<sup>e</sup>. This latter olive tree grew in the Altis<sup>f</sup>; of the site of which see Pindar<sup>g</sup>, and the Scholia. Phlegon however<sup>h</sup>, as we hope to see hereafter, gives a different account both of the origin of the custom of crowning the victors in these games with the olive, and of the discovery of the tree, appropriated to that purpose.

SECTION III.—*On the Olympic Calendar; or the particular Calendar by which the Olympia were celebrated.*

According to the common tradition, which ascribed the foundation of the Olympic games to Pelops, the Olympic calendar, in the first instance, must have been that of Pelops, or one derived from it; and the calendar of Pelops could have been nothing different from that of all mankind, the same *before* his time, and *in* his time, and *after* his time, with that of the beginning of things. But from the time of the adoption of the lunar correction of this calendar among the Greeks, and of different types of that correction, the question of the proper Olympic calendar is that of the proper civil calendar of the particular community which had the charge of the Olympic games, and was responsible for their administration. And though there can be no doubt that from the date of the first correction, B. C. 592, and of that of every subsequent one, down to the last, B. C. 468, this particular community was the people of Elis; it by no

<sup>d</sup> Opp. ii. 834. 12 a. Περὶ θαυμασ. ἀκουσ. 51.

<sup>e</sup> Cf. Schol. in Plutum, 586: Suidas, in Κοτίνου στεφάνῳ.

<sup>f</sup> Pausanias, v. xv. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Olymp. x. 54, 55.

<sup>h</sup> De Olympiis, 136-147.

means follows, from the state of the case at any of those points of time, that the Eleans must have had the care of the games from the first.

There is no reason indeed to suppose that Elis was not in existence at the time of the institution of the Olympic games; and if it was so in the Trojan æra, and long before the siege of Troy, (as it appears from Homer it was,) it may well be presumed to have been so in the time of Pelops\*. But Pisa was in existence in his time too: and while it was not inferior to Elis at that time in power and dignity, it was much more closely related to Pelops. Cœnomaus, the father-in-law of Pelops, was king of Pisa, and the most powerful king of his time. Pelops, who married Hippodamia his daughter, was king of Pisa after him<sup>i</sup>; and Pisa, under Pelops, became even more important and influential than under Cœnomaus. Olympia, where the games were celebrated, and the temple of Jupiter was afterwards erected, was close to Pisa<sup>k</sup>; but thirty or forty miles from Elis<sup>†</sup>: and it would be absurd to suppose, if the king of Pisa founded these games at Olympia, close to his own residence, and appointed them to be cele-

\* Diodorus indeed, xi. 54, speaks of a *συννοικισμὸς* of the Ἠλεῖοι, from several smaller cities, into one, called Ἱλις, in the archontic year of Præxiærgus, B. C. 471-470, according to the Tables: and he is apparently confirmed by Strabo, viii. 3. 143 b: cf. Etym. M. Ἱλις. A city, so called however seems to be recognised by Homer as in existence in the Trojan æra, Il. B. 615: and even though from other passages, (Il. B. 626. A. 672. 685. 697: Od. N. 275: O. 297: Ω. 430: Φ. 347.) he should be supposed to have designated by that name a region or district rather than a city, (the Κοῖλη Ἱλις, according to Strabo,) it will make no difference to our argument. A country so called, and a people so called, certainly existed, according to Homer, at the time of the Trojan war.

† The Scholia on Pindar indeed<sup>1</sup> would make Pisa only *fifty* stades distant from Elis; though Strabo makes it 300<sup>2</sup>, and D'Anville not less than 30 Roman miles direct. Pliny too seems to include Olympia in Elis, where he observes<sup>3</sup>, Elis. . . et intus delubrum Olympii Jovis, ludorum claritate fastos Græcorum complexum: but he means only the region or territory of Elis, which in his time no doubt comprehended Olympia.

<sup>1</sup> Olymp. i. 24. 28. cf. ad xi. 55.

<sup>2</sup> viii. 3. 171 a. cf. Schol. in Platon. ii. 405. Republica, 246. 7: ii. 393. Hippias Major, 409. 3.

<sup>3</sup> H. N. iv. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Strabo, viii. 3. 174 b.

<sup>†</sup> Ibid. viii. 3. 171 a--173 b. 174 a: Schol. ad Pind. Ol. xi. 51. 55.

brated there perpetually, he would place them under the direction of the Eleans; so much further off from the spot, and, for any thing which is known to the contrary, independent of his own jurisdiction. It is clear from the Olympic Odes of Pindar, that there was a much closer connection (at first at least) between the games and Pisa, than between the games and Elis; an association of ideas founded on the fact, that as they were instituted by a king of Pisa, close to Pisa, so they were placed at first under the administration of the people of Pisa. Πίσα<sup>1</sup> πόλις ὅπου τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἐπιτελεῖται— Πίσα<sup>m</sup> πόλις καὶ κρήνη<sup>n</sup> τῆς Ὀλυμπίας· ἔστι δὲ χωρίον ἐν ᾧ ὁ τοῦ Διὸς ναὸς ἴδρυνται, καὶ ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγὼν ἐπιτελεῖται—

Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν ταχυτῆτι ποδῶν νίκην τις ἄροιτο  
ἢ πενταθλεύων, ἔνθα Διὸς τέμενος  
παρ Πίσαιο ῥοῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ<sup>o</sup>.

The administration of the Olympic games indeed, from the time of their institution downwards, is an obscure question. It seems however agreed that the right of presiding over them was never claimed *de jure*, nor exercised *de facto*, by any communities among the Greeks, but the people of Elis, and the people of Pisa; of which two, forasmuch as the founder of the games themselves was an ancient king of Pisa, it is evident that the latter, *a priori*, must have had the best claim to any right or privilege transmitted from him. And there is every reason to suppose that *this* in particular, of presiding over the games, was theirs *de facto* as well as *de jure* at first; though in the course of time it might pass into other hands. We read of no interruption to the regular administration of the games by one or the other of these two, except in the time of Phædon, king of Argos, the tenth in descent from Temenus, the leader of that part of the Heraclidæ which settled in Argolis. For this Phædon, having recovered the conquests of Hercules in the Peloponnese, grounded on that fact, according to Ephorus<sup>p</sup>, a claim to the administration of the games also, of any kind, founded by Hercules: Τούτων δὲ εἶναι καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπιακόν. And

<sup>1</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>m</sup> Steph. Byz.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. Strabo, viii. 3. 175 a-b.

<sup>o</sup> Xenophanes, apud Athenæum, x. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Strabo, viii. cap. 3. ad fin.: cf. Aristotle, *Politica*, v. 10. 139. 6: Herodotus, vi. 127.

though his time in the Parian Chronicle is referred to B. C. 895 4; according to the Olympic ἀναγραφαί, the actual date of this usurpation of his was Olymp. viii, B. C. 748 5: and even he was abetted by the people of Pisa, as if he was asserting *their* right in opposition to that of the people of Elis, as much as his own\*.

The truth indeed appears to be *this*. The people of Pisa, as was naturally to be expected, inherited the superintendance of the games from Pelops their founder, and actually exercised it down to the time of Iphitus, and of the revival of the games by him: but as Iphitus himself was king of

\* It was observed by the ancient commentators on Homer, that the name of the people of Pisa did not occur in his Catalogue; and the reason assigned for their omission seems to have been, that they were excused from serving in the expedition, because they were dedicated to the service of the Olympian Zeus: Φασί τε τοὺς Πισάτας μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου ἱεροῦ νομισθέντας τοῦ Διός<sup>1</sup>. According to the Scholia on Homer<sup>2</sup>, the people of Pisa presided at the games originally; but having sided with the Messenians in the first or the second Messenian war, they were deprived of their privilege by the Lacedæmonians, who transferred it to the people of Elis. On the other hand, the Scholiast on Plato<sup>3</sup> tells us that when Iphitus, Lycurgus, and Cleisthenes restored the games, they appointed the people of Elis to preside at them, but that they themselves made over this privilege to the people of Pisa: of which statement probably nothing is true, except that Iphitus, and his colleagues in the work of the restoration, appointed the Eleans to have the charge of the games, as thus restored, even though they might not have had it before. Strabo asserts<sup>4</sup>, that the Eleans presided from the first Olympiad to the twenty-sixth, when they were dispossessed for a time by the people of Pisa: and as this was the Olympiad (B. C. 672) last before the close of the second Messenian war. (B. C. 668,) it is not improbable that the Eleans, having exercised this privilege from the time of Iphitus down to B. C. 672, lost it then, or B. C. 668, from some connection of theirs with that war.

Eusebius<sup>5</sup> has the xxviii<sup>th</sup> and the xxx<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, by the people of Pisa; and the Olympic ἀναγραφαί<sup>6</sup> had Olymp. xxx–lii, B. C. 660–572, by them<sup>7</sup>. According to Pausanias also<sup>8</sup>, the xxxiv<sup>th</sup> Olympiad was celebrated by them, and their king Pantaleon.

1 Strabo, viii. 3. 173 b.

2 Il. A. 700.

3 ii. 405. Resp. 246. 7.

4 viii. 3. 173 a—174 a.

5 Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 285.

6 286.

6 Ibid. i. 286.

7 Cf. Anecdota Græca Par. ii. 143.

8 Also, Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, i. 192. 236.

8 vi. xxii. 1.

4 Epocha xxxi.

1 Pausanias, vi. xxii. 1.

Elis, it was just as natural that from that time forward the people of Elis should have the charge of them, as the people of Pisa until then; and equally probably by the appointment of Iphitus himself. It is certain at least that, whatsoever the time and the occasion, when, and on which, the superintendence of the games first passed to the Eleans; it was considered in the course of time to have become theirs by a kind of prescriptive right, which nobody thought of calling in question. There can be no doubt that they were in possession of this right, and exercising it at the epoch of the first lunar correction of the Greeks—if at least the fact which Herodotus relates of them and Psammis, king of Egypt, is true<sup>s</sup>: for the reign of Psammis, according to Herodotus<sup>t</sup>, was circumscribed by B. C. 600, and B. C. 594; and between these dates the Eleans were acting as the recognised curators of the games. There can be no doubt too that they were still retaining and still exercising this right at the date of the Metonic correction, B. C. 432; nor, if we except one Olympiad, (Ol. civ, B. C. 364,) when the people of Pisa, assisted by the Arcadians, dispossessed them of it by force<sup>v</sup>, do we read in Greek history of any interruption of it. This right was respected by the Spartans, even at the close of the war, which arose out of the dispute concerning Lepreum, B. C. 420<sup>x</sup>, and was not decided until B. C. 399<sup>y</sup>: when Xenophon, speaking of the treatment of the Eleans at last, observes, Τοῦ μέντοι προεστάναι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἱεροῦ, καίπερ οὐκ ἀρχαίου Ἰλιείους ὄντος, οὐκ ἀπήλασαν αὐτοὺς, νομίζοντες τοὺς ἀντιποιοιουμένους (the people of Pisa, no doubt) χωρίτας εἶναι, καὶ οὐχ ἱκανοὺς προεστάναι: which very clearly implies that it was well known the Eleans had no original claim to this presidency; none but what was founded on long possession, and on the competency for the office, above their competitors, which long experience in the discharge of its duties had acquired for them\*.

\* Eustathius, ad Iliad. B. 615. 304. 3: Ὡς δὲ καὶ περὶ γυμνάσια εὐδοκίμων (Ἡλείοι) δηλοῖ ὁ αὐτὸς, εἰπὼν: Γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας διατιθέτωσαν Ἡλείοι,

<sup>s</sup> ii. 160.

<sup>t</sup> ii. 160, 161: iii. 10. 14. cf. our Fasti Catholici, ii. 547. 514.

<sup>v</sup> Hellenica, vii. iv. 28: Pausanias, vi. xxii. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Thucydides, v. 49, 50. cf. 40.

<sup>y</sup> Hellenica, iii. ii. 31.



There can be no question that, in the time of Pindar, the presidents were the Eleans, and long had been so; that it was the duty of the Eleans, in his time, to announce the Olympic ἐκεχειρία, to preside over the games as often as they came round, and to adjudge the prizes—

Ὅν τε καὶ κάρυκες ὤρᾶν  
ἀνέγων, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα  
Ζηγὸς Ἄλκιοι, παθύντες  
πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον<sup>z</sup>.

Ἄ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν<sup>α</sup> τᾶς ἄπο  
θεύμοροι νίσσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους αἰοδαί,  
ᾧτινι κραίνων ἐφετμὰς  
Ἡρακλέος προτέρας  
ἀτρεκῆς Ἑλλανοδικᾶς γλεφάρων  
Αἰτωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν  
ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλοι γλαν-  
κόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας<sup>β</sup>.

For these Hellanodikæ, the umpires in the games, were Eleans; one from each of the tribes of the Eleans, and varying in number at different times with the number of the tribes. The first author of the Olympic Ἀναγραφαὶ or Register was Hippias the Elean, and the most authentic accounts of the early history and administration of the games appear to have been derived from the Eleans. So notorious, in short, in later times, was this connection between them and the Olympic games, that Elean and Olympian are used as synonymous terms.

Hic vel ad Elei metas et maxima campi  
Sudabit spatia<sup>b</sup>.

Est quibus Eleæ concurrit palma quadrigæ—  
Est quibus in celeres gloria nata pedes<sup>c</sup>.

Quantum clamore juvatur  
Eleus sonipes<sup>d</sup>.

Κορίνθιοι θυμελικοὺς, Ἀθηναῖοι σκηνηκοὺς· εἰ δέ τις τούτων πλημμελοίη μα-  
στιγούσθωσαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι: the original of which is found in Athenæus,  
viii. 42.

Of the competency and skill of the Eleans in the administration of gymnastic contests, see Dio Chrys. xii. 382. 15: xxxi. 625. 40: Aristides, xlv. Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττ. 411. 10: Philostratus, Vita Apollonii, iv. viii: 180 D-ix. 186 D: ix. 185 A—188 B.

<sup>z</sup> Isthmia, ii. 34. cf. Schol. in loc.

<sup>a</sup> Olymp. iii. 17.

<sup>b</sup> Virg. Georg. iii. 202.

<sup>c</sup> Propertius, iii. ix. 17.

<sup>d</sup> Lucan, Pharsalia, i. 293.

Under these circumstances, it may be taken for granted that, if the Olympic games came ultimately to be regulated by any particular calendar, distinct from that which had been prescribed for them by their founder, it must have been that of Elis.

SECTION IV.—*On the Olympic Rule of later times, and its proper Characters.*

i. First Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic Season.

The peculiar notes of the Olympic Rule in the classical period of Greek history have long been familiar to chronologers; and it might seem to be almost superfluous to enter upon the formal consideration of them. But the object which we have in view by these inquiries, and the use which we purpose to make of the Olympic Rule in later times for the discovery of that of the institution at first, requires us to treat even this part of our subject as something new or uncertain. We shall therefore, with as much brevity as the nature of the case, and justice to the argument itself, and the importance of the end to which it is subservient, may admit, proceed to ascertain each of the characters of this rule, as a simple matter of fact, in later times; before we endeavour to make use of any of them for the determination of that of former times.

The first of these characters is the Olympic *season*; the Olympic *καρπὸς* or *tempestas*—the time of the year at which the Olympic games were celebrated. These games had a proper season in the natural year; and modern chronologers are generally agreed in assuming this as midsummer. Yet we do not find any statement on record at present, which affirms it in so many words. Censorinus'<sup>c</sup>—*Diebus dumtaxat æstivis quibus Olympia celebrantur*—or Seneca's<sup>f</sup>—*Quinta quaque æstate per Olympia*—defines only the relation of this season to the summer in general; and would apply to the state of the case had the rule always been to celebrate the games any time in the summer quarter, in contradistinction to the vernal, or to the autumnal. The nearest approach

<sup>c</sup> De Die Natali, xxi.

<sup>f</sup> Opp. v. 197. Natur. Quest. iii. xxvi. 4.

to an express definition of the Olympic season occurs in a fragment, quoted in the scholia on Pindar<sup>g</sup>, which we shall have occasion to produce hereafter; and even that, as it stands at present, appears to assign them a double period in the course of the summer quarter, one which, according to the division of the natural year made by the ancients, was the beginning of the *ὑπέρωρα*, the other, the heliacal rising of Arcturus: terms and *στηρίγματα* these, in relation to the summer quarter, as far distant from each other as a certain time in the month of July from the same in the month of September.

From circumstantial evidence indeed, or the proof of the fact supplied by contemporary testimony, it would be easy to shew that in repeated instances the games must have been going on at or about midsummer; and therefore that if they had from the first a stated relation to the natural or the Julian year, it must have been that of midsummer. Our oldest authority however, for this or any other circumstance of the ancient rule, is Pindar; and it may be inferred even from his account of the institution of the games by Hercules, that as these first games, so every other, must have coincided with the hottest period of the natural year. The site of Olympia itself, according to the old Scholiast<sup>h</sup>, in the midst of a naked plain, was dry and exposed to the sun—*Κατάθερμος καὶ πυρώδης καὶ ἀσκίαστος*: but that would only render it still hotter at midsummer. And the inconvenience arising from this source, according to Pindar, began to be so soon felt, that before the institution was yet completed, and the first games had yet been celebrated, he supposes it necessary for Hercules to plant a grove of olive-trees all round about the race-course—which, with a poet's license, he makes him fetch from the country of the Hyperboreans (i. e. from the coolest and most temperate region of the earth, where trees and plants of every kind were green and fresh even in the summer), on purpose to plant in one of the dryest and the hottest, especially in the middle of the summer.

Ἄλλ' οὐ καλὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλε  
 χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος.  
 τούτων ἔδοξε

<sup>g</sup> Ad Olymp. iii. 33.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 42.

γυμνὸς αὐτῷ κᾶπος ὀξεί-  
 αῖς ὑπακουέμεν αὐγαῖς ἀλίου.  
 δὴ τότε ἔς γαίαν πορεύειν θυμὸς ὄρμαιν'  
 Ἰστρίαν νιν' κ', τ. λ.  
 .. τόθι δένδρεα θαύμαιε σταθείς.  
 τῶν νιν γλυκὸς ἴμερος ἔσχειν  
 δωδεκάγαμπτον\* περὶ τέρμα δρόμου  
 ἵππων φυτεῦσαι<sup>1</sup>.

We may therefore take it for granted that the proper season of the Olympic games, from the earliest to the latest times, must have been the hottest period in the natural year; i. e. at or about the summer solstice †.

\* In illustration of this allusion to the number of courses or *heats* (as we should call them) in the horse or chariot race at the Olympic games, see the Schol. ad Olymp. ii. 83: Δωδεκάκις γὰρ περιήρχετο τὸν δρόμον τὰ τέλεια ἄρματα. Also, ad 91. 92: and iii. 59. where it is again observed that the τέλειον ἄρμα made twelve of these heats, the πωλικὸν eight. Cf. also Olymp. vi. 126: Pyth. v. 39. where the scholiast quotes from Callimachus:

Δωδεκάκις περὶ δίφρον ἐπήγαγεν ἴθματα δίφρου—

which proves that the rule in this respect was the same at the Pythian games also. Cf. the *Electra* of Sophocles, 741 sqq.

† It may be inferred from Manilius, speaking of Cancer, that most of the athletic games of antiquity must have been celebrated at that season of the year when the sun was in Cancer; i. e. at midsummer; no doubt in imitation of the Olympia, which first set the example in that respect.

Tum Cererem fragili properat distinguere culmo  
 Graius, et in patrias denudat membra palæstras,  
 Et tepidum pelagus siccatis languet in undis, &c.  
 Hic rerum status est Cancri cum sidere Phœbus  
 Solstitium facit, et summo vectatur Olympo<sup>1</sup>.

The scene of Lucian's dialogue between Anacharsis and Solon<sup>2</sup> is laid in Attica in the hottest season of the year, and no doubt purposely; because the final end of that system of training and exercise, the merits of which were discussed by the parties in this conversation, was to prepare the subjects of such a discipline, either as candidates at the games, or for the field of battle—in both of which they would be liable to be exposed alike to the heat of a burning sun. Anacharsis, soon after the beginning of the dialogue, is represented as inviting Solon to retire into the shade<sup>3</sup>: Ἄλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ ἐς τὸ σύσκιον ἐκεῖσε ἀπελθόντες, καθίσωμεν ἐπὶ τῶν θιάκων . . .

<sup>1</sup> Olymp. iii. 40–60.

<sup>1</sup> iii. 629. cf. 625: 256, 257.

<sup>2</sup> Anacharsis, sive De Gymnasiis.

<sup>3</sup> Opp. ii. 895. De Gymn. 16, 78.

ἄλλως τε (εἰρήσεται γὰρ) οὐδὲ τὸν ἥλιον ἔτι ραδίως ἀνέχομαι, ὄξυν καὶ φλογώδη ἐμπίπτοντα γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ. τὸν γὰρ πῦλόν μοι ἀφελεῖν οἴκοθεν ἔδοξεν, ὡς μὴ μόνος ἐν ὑμῖν ξενίζοιμι τῷ σχήματι. ἡ δὲ ὥρα τοῦ ἔτους ὅτεπερ τὸ πυρωδέστατόν ἐστι τοῦ ἀστέρος, ὃν ὑμεῖς κίνα φατέ, πάντα καταφλέγοντος, καὶ τὸν ἀέρα ξηρὸν καὶ διακαῆ τιθέντος· ὃ τε ἥλιος, κατὰ μεσημβρίαν ἤδη ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐπικείμενος, φλογμὸν τοῦτον οὐ φορητὸν ἐπάγει τοῖς σώμασιν. ὥστε καὶ σου θαυμάζω, ὅπως γηραιὸς ἤδη ἄνθρωπος οὔτε ἰδίεις πρὸς τὸ θάλπος, ὥσπερ ἐγὼ, οὔτε ὄλως ἐνοχλουμένῳ ἔοικας, οὐδὲ περιβλέπεις σύσκιόν τι, ἔνθα ὑποδύση, ἀλλὰ δέχη τὸν ἥλιον εὐμαρῶς<sup>4</sup>.

We thus learn that the spectators of these exercises or these contests were bareheaded themselves, as much as the candidates: and Basil tells us such was the rule at the games of antiquity generally, that the spectators wore no covering for their heads—and stood or sate all the time, exposed to the inconvenience of a burning sun, which would be nowhere greater in Greece than at Olympia, and at midsummer<sup>5</sup>: Τὸν ἀθλητῶν θεατῆρ μετέχειν τινὸς προσήκε καὶ αὐτὸν εὐτονίας. καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν θεσμῶν ἂν τις κατίδοι, οἱ τοὺς συγκαθεζομένους εἰς τὸ στάδιον γυμνῇ καθῆσθαι τῇ κεφαλῇ διαγορεύουσιν κ', τ. λ. Ælian<sup>6</sup> tells a story of a certain Chian, who, being angry with one of his slaves, instead of threatening to send him to the mill, as usual in such cases, threatened to send him to Olympia, to see the games there: Πολλῶ γὰρ ᾤετο πικροτέραν, ὡς τὸ εἶδος, εἶναι τιμωρίαν ἐκείνος, ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ θεώμενον ὑπὸ τῆς ἀκτίνας ὀπτάσθαι, ἢ ἀλείν μύλην παραδοθέντα. Cicero too observes in his Brutus<sup>7</sup>, Sed ut pugiles inexercitati, etiam si pugnos et plagas Olympiorum cupidi ferre possunt, solem tamen sæpe ferre non possunt—as if the heat was the greatest hardship, and the most intolerable of all, which the candidates for the prize at Olympia had to endure. Nor can there be much doubt that such must actually have been the case. We read of athletes who tired out their adversaries merely by their superior powers of endurance in this way, and won the victory without striking a blow. It is recorded of Thales that he died at the Olympic games, purely from the heat of the weather, and the crowding, at such times; and Lucian tells us<sup>8</sup> that partly from the time of the year at which the games were celebrated, partly from the aridity and exposedness of the place itself—the spectators of these games were liable to violent fevers; and he reckons it not the least of the good offices, which a certain person, (whose name is not mentioned, but whom we know to have been Herodes Atticus, one of his contemporaries,) had conferred on the Greeks at large, that he had done his best to mitigate this evil, and to provide for the refreshment of the people assembled on such occasions, by bringing water at his own expense to Olympia: "Ἄρτι δὲ ἄνδρα παιδείᾳ καὶ ἀξιώματι προὔχοντα, διότι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις εὖ ἐποίησε τὴν Ἑλλάδα, καὶ ὕδωρ ἐπήγαγε τῇ Ὀλυμπίᾳ, καὶ ἔπαυσε δίψῃ ἀπολλυμένους τοὺς πανηγυριστὰς, κακῶς ἠγόρευεν ὡς καταθελύναντα τοὺς Ἕλληνας, δέον τοὺς θεατὰς τῶν Ὀλυμπίων διακαρτερεῖν διψῶντας, καὶ . . ἀποθνήσκειν πολ-

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the answer of Solon.

<sup>5</sup> i. 49 E. Hexaëmeron, vi. i. ad princip.

<sup>6</sup> Variæ, xiv. 18.

<sup>7</sup> 69. 243.

<sup>8</sup> Opp. iii. 343. De Morte Peregrini, § 19, 80.

λοὺς αὐτῶν ὑπὸ σφοδρῶν τῶν νόσων, αἱ τέως διὰ τὸ ξηρὸν τοῦ χωρίου ἐν πολλῶ τῷ πλήθει ἐπεπόλαζον<sup>10</sup>. The πνίγος at Olympia is again also alluded to by Lucian<sup>11</sup>.

A story is told of Anaxagoras that he appeared on some occasion at the Olympic games with a κώδιον, or fleece, over his shoulders; i. e. as we should say, in a great coat—and got much credit for sagacity, as if he had foreseen a storm of rain which came on unexpectedly: Καὶ τίς οὐκ οἶδε τὸν Ἀναξαγόραν Ὀλυμπίασι μὲν ὁπότε ἦκιστα ὕοι παρελθόντα ὑπὸ κωδίῳ εἰς τὸ στάδιον ἐπὶ προρρήσει ὄμβρου<sup>12</sup>; The important words here are these, ὁπότε ἦκιστα ὕοι—when, not where, it most seldom rained—for that is an argument, that the season of the games at Olympia must have been the season of midsummer. Yet that rain did sometimes fall even there and then, may be inferred from a story which Philostratus tells of an athlete called Plutarchus, who owed his success to a shower of rain which happened to fall at the time<sup>13</sup>: Ἡγωνίζετο μὲν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ πρὸς Ἑρμείαν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον τὴν περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου νίκην. ἀπειρηκότες δὲ ὁ μὲν ὑπὸ τραυμάτων ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ δίψης, καὶ γὰρ ἀκμάζουσα μεσημβρία περὶ τὴν πυγμὴν εἰστήκει, νεφέλη ἐς τὸ στάδιον καταρρήγνυται· καὶ διψῶν ὁ Πλούταρχος ἔσπασε τοῦ ὕδατος ὃ ἀνελήφει τὰ περὶ τοῖς πήχεσι κώδια.

The heat of the weather at the Olympic games, and consequently the proper Olympic season, may be judged of from the numbers and troublesome-ness of the flies at that season; so much so that, according to tradition, a special sacrifice to Zeus Ἀπόμνιος was appointed by Hercules, in order to get rid of them for the occasion. Ἀπόμνιος· οὕτως ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ τοῖς Ἡλείοις τιμᾶται, Ἡρακλέους ἰδρυσάμενου ἐπὶ ἀποτροπῇ τῶν μυῶν<sup>14</sup>. Ælian thus describes the effect of these sacrifices<sup>15</sup>: Αἱ μυῖαι αἱ Πισατίδες κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἐορτὴν ὡς ἂν εἴποις σπένδονται καὶ τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις καὶ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις. ἱερείων γοῦν καταθυομένων τοσοῦτων . . . αἶδε ἀφανίζονται ἐκοῦσαι, καὶ τοῦ γε Ἀλφειοῦ περαιοῦνται ἐς τὴν ἀντιπέραν ὄχθην. καὶ εἰκόασι τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν ἐπιχωρίων διαλλάττειν οὐδὲ ὀλίγον . . . τὰς μὲν γὰρ ὁ τῆς ἀγωνίας . . . νόμος ἐλαύνει τὰς γυναικας· αἱ μυῖαι δὲ ἐκοῦσαι τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀφίστανται . . . λύτο δ' ἀγὼν αἱ δὲ ἐπιδημοῦσιν . . . εἶτα ἐπιρρέουσιν εἰς τὴν Ἥλιον αἱ μυῖαι αὐθις ὡς αἱ γυναικες. Eustathius says the flies were propitiated by the sacrifice of an ox—which they had all to themselves<sup>16</sup>: Τὸ δὲ καὶ μυῖαις Ὀλυμπίαζε βοῦν ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει κατακόπτεσθαι φιλότιμον μὲν οὐκ ἂν εἴη, ἀργαλεότητα δὲ τοῦ ζωῦφιόν δηλοῖ πολλήν.

Lastly, that the Olympic season must have been notoriously the hottest in the year, may be inferred from the following allusions in Statius—

<sup>10</sup> Opp. iii. 343. De Morte Peregrini, § 19, 80. cf. Philostratus, Vita Soph. ii. 550 A: 555 C: 562 B-C. Herodes Atticus.

<sup>11</sup> i. 837. Herodotus sive Ætion, cap. 8, 33.

<sup>12</sup> Philostratus, Vita Apollonii, i. ii. 3. B D: Suidas, Ἀναξαγόρας: Ælian, De Nat. vii. 8: Diogenes Laërtius, i. iii. v. § 10.

<sup>13</sup> Heroica, 649 D-650 B. Protesil.

<sup>14</sup> Etym. M. cf. Pausanias, v. xiv. 2: Clemens Alex. Protrepticon, ii. § 38. 32, 33.

<sup>15</sup> De Natura Anim. v. 17. cf. xi. 8: Pliny, H. N. x. 40: xxix. 34. p. 421: Pausanias, viii. xxvi. 4. A similar sacrifice at Aliphera in Arcadia.

<sup>16</sup> In Odysse. Γ. 8. 1454. 25. cf. Athenæus, v. 7.

- i. Illum nec calido latravit Sirius astro,  
Nec gravis aspexit Nemees frondentis alumnus ;  
Talis hyems tectis, frangunt sic improba solem  
Frigora, Pisæumque domus non æstuat annum <sup>17</sup>.
- ii. Non aliter quam Pisæo sua lustra Tonanti  
Cum redeunt, crudisque virum sudoribus ardet  
Pulvis <sup>18</sup>.
- iii. Jam terras volucremque polum fuga veris aquosi  
Laxat, et Icariis cœlum latratibus urit :  
Ardua jam densæ rarescunt mœnia Romæ.  
Hos Præneste sacrum, nemus hos glaciale Dianæ,  
Algidus aut horrens, aut Tuscula protegit umbra ;  
Tiburis hi lucos, Anienaque frigora captant.  
Te quoque clamosæ quænam plaga mitior Urbi  
Subtrahit ? *æstivos* quo decipis aëre soles ?  
Quid, tuus ante omnes, tua cura potissima Gallus,  
Nec non noster amor ? . . . . .  
. . . . . Latiis æstivat in oris <sup>19</sup> ?

The time of this *Sylva* consequently was midsummer, when most people had left or were leaving Rome, especially the lawyers, who usually left for the country in July <sup>20</sup>. And that this is the time intended in the present instance appears from the following in the same poem :

Certe jam Latiae non miscent jurgia leges,  
Et pacem piger annus habet, *messesque reversæ*  
Dimisere forum <sup>21</sup>.

It was the month of July, and the long vacation. Statius himself was now at Baiae.

Hæc ego Chalcidicis ad te, Marcelle, sonabam  
Litoribus <sup>22</sup>.

The *fuga veris aquosi* <sup>19</sup> consequently meant the *end* of the spring quarter, and the *beginning* of the summer quarter, midsummer. And that this was the usual season of the Olympic games appears from the following lines <sup>23</sup>.

Sed tu, dum nimio possessa Hyperione flagrat  
Torva Cleonæi juba sideris, exue curis  
Pectus, et assiduo temet furare labori.  
Et sontes operit pharetras arcumque retendit  
Parthus ; et *Elæis auriga laboribus actis*

<sup>17</sup> *Silvæ*, i. iii. 5. Villa Tiburtina Manlii Vopisci. cf. iii. i. 52-60 : 139-143.

<sup>18</sup> Thebais, i. 42 f.

<sup>19</sup> *Silvæ*, iv. iv. 12. ad Victorem Marcellum.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Seneca, *Opp.* iv. 390. *Ludus De Morte Cl. Cæs.* vii. 4 : xii. cf. *Suet. Claud.* xiv. 4 : *Dio*, lx. 4 : *Pliny*, *Epp.* viii. 21.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 39.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 78.

<sup>23</sup> *Vers.* 27 sqq.

## ii. Second Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic Cycle.

The Olympic Cycle was the interval between one instance of the celebration of the games, in the regular course of things, and the next to it; and of all the characters of the rule this is that about which there is the least uncertainty. This interval, except in one instance of very late date, which we had occasion to consider in the first Part of the present Work (that of Olymp. cex. and cexi. <sup>k</sup>) was never known to have been *de facto* either more or less than *four* years. As a measure of time for historical purposes, it was invariably assumed as a period of *four* years—Τοῦ τετραετοῦς διάστηματος, ὃ φάμεν δεῖν Ὀλυμπιάδα νομίζειν<sup>l</sup>, or, as the same passage is quoted in the Excerpta Vaticana of Angelo Maiο—"Ὅτι τοῦ τετραετοῦς διαστήματος τὴν περίοδον Ὀλυμπιάδα φάμεν εἶναι. For this reason some of the later chronologers transferred the name of Olympiads to the cycle of the Julian leap-year<sup>m</sup>: and others assumed the Olympic cycle of the ancient Greeks itself as a cycle of that kind from the first: for which assumption, as we hope to see hereafter, there was probably better foundation than even those who made it were aware. Ὀλυμπιάς δέ ἐστι παρ' Ἑλλησι τετραετηρικὸς χρόνος, οὗ κατὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν ἀρχομένου τοῦ ἔτους ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγὼν ἤγετο<sup>n</sup>—Ὀλυμπιάς δὲ παρ' Ἑλλησι καλεῖται ὁ κατὰ τέσσαρα ἔτη συντελούμενος ἀγὼν, διὰ τὴν κατὰ τετραετίαν τῶν τοῦ ἡλίου δρόμων ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἔτος τριῶν ὠρῶν\* συντελουμένην ἡμέραν<sup>o</sup>. κ', τ. λ.

*Alpheo permulcet equos; et nostra fatiscit  
Laxaturque chelys; vires instigat, alitque  
Tempestiva quies: major post otia virtus.*

Not that this Sylva, the date of which was A. D. 95, was written in an Olympic year, but simply at the time when the Olympia in such a year would have been going on. The Olympic month in Statius' time was uniformly July. The Olympia, A. D. 93, the last before this Sylva, were celebrated July 1—6; those of A. D. 97, the first after it, July 16—21.

\* Three hours, i. e. 3 × 2, or 6; the difference of the year of 365 days,

<sup>k</sup> Vol. ii. 121—123.

<sup>l</sup> Polybius, ix. Proem. i. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Vide our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony, i. 272, 273 n. Also our Origines Kalendarie Italice, ii. 225 n.

<sup>n</sup> Syncellus, 368. 13. cf. the Anec-

dota Græca Paris. iii. 374 1.

<sup>o</sup> Anecdota Græca Par. iv. 187. 20. Cyrilli Lexicon, and Suidas, Ὀλυμπιάς, in both which this passage occurs, referred to Cyrill of Jerusalem (Cateches. xii. 8. p. 158. 1.)



In the Greek idiom, a cycle of four years was spoken of as a *πεντετηρίς*: and such is the style in which the Olympic cycle is spoken of by Pindar.

- i. Ἦδη γὰρ αὐτῶ, (sc. Ἡρακλεῖ,)  
πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἀγισθέν-  
των κ', τ. λ.  
καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν  
καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ἀμᾶ  
θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς Ἀλφειοῦ<sup>ο</sup>.
- ii. Τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρσω  
κατέφρασεν, ὅπα τὰν πολέμοιο δόσιν  
ἀκρόθινα διελὼν ἔθνε, καὶ πεντα-  
ετηρίδ' ὅπως ἄρα ἔστασεν ἑορτὰν  
κ', τ. λ.<sup>p</sup>
- iii. Ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρκον, ἐμὰν δόξαν, παρὰ Κασταλία  
καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολῶν ὄχθῳ Κρόνου  
κάλλιον ἂν δηριῶν-  
των ἐνόστησ' ἀντιπάλων,  
πενταετηρίδ' ἑορτὰν  
Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον  
κωμάσαις κ', τ. λ.<sup>q</sup>

In the lunar calendar of later times the interval between consecutive Olympiads is found expressed in months: *Γίνεται δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἐννέα μηνῶν ποτὲ δὲ διὰ πεντήκοντα*<sup>r</sup>—49 months complete in the former case, 50 in the latter. So Porphyry too<sup>s</sup>—*Καὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπιάων δὲ ἐναλλάξ ἀγομένων διὰ ν' μῆνας (μηνῶν) καὶ μθ', οἱ ποιηταὶ πεντηκοντάμηνον φασὶ τὴν πανήγυριν*: and Tzetzes, though not with so much precision as the two preceding—*Ἐτελεῖτο δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν κατὰ πενταετηρίδα, ἢ τὸ σαφέστερον φᾶναι κατὰ μῆνας πεντήκοντα*<sup>t</sup>—

Ἡ δ' Ὀλυμπία τόπος ἦν περὶ τὴν Τριφυλίαν,  
ὅπου καὶ νῦν ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ Ἀλφειὸς εἰσρέει.  
οὐπερ τὸ πρὶν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς Διὶ τῶ Ὀλυμπίῳ

and the mean Julian year, being reckoned here at three *double* hours, that is, six in all; a supposition which occurs in Epiphanius also. In Cyrill indeed there is a various reading of *ἐξ ὥρων* for *τριῶν* or *τρίτων ὥρων*.

<sup>ο</sup> Olymp. iii. 33.

<sup>p</sup> x. 67.

<sup>q</sup> Nemea, xi. 30. cf. Schol. ad Olymp.

iii. 38: x. 28: 68, 69: ii. 166.

<sup>r</sup> Vetus Schol. ad Olymp. iii. 35.

<sup>s</sup> Schol. in Iliad. K. 252. p. 285. 1.

<sup>2</sup>. ad dextr.

<sup>t</sup> Ad Lycophr. 40-43.

ἀγῶνα τέθεικε λαμπρὸν ἐκ σκύλων τῶν Αὐγείου  
 οὐ στέφος ἦν τοῖς νικηταῖς θάλος ἀγριελαίου.  
 ἐξετελείτο δ' ὁ ἀγὼν πεντηκονταμηναῖος γ.

This therefore may also be taken for granted, as another unquestionable peculiarity of the Olympic rule, that the Olympic period was a cycle of four years—the interval from one celebration of the games to the next in order to it, whether in the solar or the lunar calendar, was never either more or less than four years\*.

\* Καὶ ὅσαι ἐν ἑορταῖς ἀμιλλαι χορῶν ἀναγκαῖαι γίνεσθαι, ταχθέντων τοῖς θεοῖς. . . μνηῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν καὶ ἐνιαυτῶν. . . εἴτε τριετηρίδες εἴτε αὐτὰ καὶ διὰ πέμπτων ἐτῶν<sup>1</sup>—' Ἀλλὰ μὴν τῶν γε μυστηρίων τὰ μὲν ὡς ἀρχαία τετίμηται τὰ δ' ὡς ἀναγκαῖα, τὰ δ' ὡς πλείστοις γνώριμα. πάσαις τοῖνυν ταῖς ψήφοις προφέρει τὰ Ἐλευσίνια. . . μόνοι δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ποιεῖτε πανήγυριν οὐδεμιᾶς πεντετηρίδος φαυλοτέραν<sup>2</sup>. From both these passages it might be inferred that the principal solemnities among the Greeks were notoriously trieteric (i. e. biennial) in their recurrence, or penteteric, (i. e. quadriennial,) the Olympia belonging to the latter class.

Postea cognito errore<sup>3</sup> hoc tempus (τὴν διετηρίδα) duplicarunt, et τετραετηρίδα fecerunt. sed eam, quod quinto quoque anno redibat, πενταετηρίδα nominabant. . . quare agon et in Elide Jovi Olympio et Romæ Capitolino quarto quoque anno redeunte celebratur. . . sed horum omnium (annorum scilicet) πενταετηρίδας maxime notandis temporibus Græci observant, id est quaternum annorum circuitus, quas vocant Olympiadas : et nunc apud eos ducentesima quinquagesima quarta Olympias numeratur, ejusque annus hic secundus<sup>4</sup>—

Εἰ γὰρ ἐπλοῦται, πῶς ἂν ποιῶν τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν αὐτὸς ἀγῶνα,  
 ἵνα τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἅπαντας αἰεὶ δι' ἔτους πέμπτου ξυναγείρει,  
 ἀνεκέρυττεν τῶν ἀσκητῶν τοὺς νικῶντας, στεφανώσας  
 κοτινῶ στεφάνῳ<sup>5</sup> ;

On which the Scholiast : Κατὰ πεντέχρονον ἐγένετο εἰς τὰ Ὀλύμπια συνήθροισις—Τί δὲ εἶπε ποιούσι θαυμαστὸν (Ἰηλείοι scil.) εἰ δι' ἐτῶν τεσσάρων μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ χρῶνται τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ<sup>6</sup> ;—Ex quibus Eleus Hipprius cum Olym-

<sup>1</sup> Chilias, i. 576. Histor. 21. cf. the Scholia on the Posthomericæ of Tzetzes, Μεγακύνκλους τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἔλεγον,

ὅτι κατὰ πεντήκοντα μῆνας ἐτελεῖτο τὰ Ὀλύμπια : Dodwell, De Cyclis, 804.

<sup>2</sup> Plato, Opp. iii. iii. 87. 19. De Legibus, viii.

<sup>3</sup> Aristides, xiii. 311. 13. cf. xix. 420. 17. Eleusinius.

<sup>4</sup> Censorinus, De Die, xviii.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Solinus, Polyhistor, i. § 28.

<sup>6</sup> Aristophanes, Plutus, 583, De Jove.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, Apophthegmata Regum, Agis, iii. cf. Apophthegmata Laconica, Agis, x, where it is, Εἰ ἐν ἔτεσι πέντε μιᾷ μόνον ἡμέρᾳ δικαιοσύνῃ χρῶνται : and Lycurgus, xx, where it is expressed by δι' ἐτῶν πέντε κ', τ. λ.

pian venisset maxima illa *quinquenniali* celebritate ludorum<sup>7</sup>—Ὀλυμπιάς δ' τετραετηρικός ἀγών· εἰσὶ δὲ τέσσαρες ἀγῶνες, Ὀλύμπια Ἴσθμια Νέμεα καὶ Πίθια—Olympias apud Græcos constituta, apud Elidem Græciæ civitatem, Eleis agentibus agonem et quinquennale certamen, quatuor mediis annis vacantibus: et ob hoc Elidum certaminis tempus Olympiadem vocaverunt, quadriennio in una Olympiade supputato<sup>9</sup>—Καὶ ἀγαπῶντα (scil. τὸν Δία) εἰ διὰ πέντε ὄλων ἐτῶν θύσει τις αἰτῶ πάρεργον Ὀλυμπίων<sup>10</sup>—Olympias autem dicebatur tempus quinque annorum: siquidem expletis quatuor annis quinto quoque anno celebrabatur festivitas in honorem Jovis Olympii<sup>11</sup>—Ab Elide civitate Græciæ<sup>12</sup>, ubi antiquitus celebratus quinquennalis agō in honorem Olympici Jovis, quinquennalis dicitur quia post quinque annos celebratur lusus quadrigarum sive ceterorum exercitiorum. The testimony of Pindar to the cycle of the games has been quoted<sup>13</sup>.

The Olympic period is illustrated also by the fact which has been handed down respecting the fountain Arethusa in Sicily, and the Alphæus at Olympia—as if there was a submarine communication between them, which at the Olympic games more particularly was sensibly attested: Τὴν ἐν Συρακοῖσιν τῆς Σικελίας πηγὴν Ἀρέθουσαν διὰ πενταετηρίδος κινεῖσθαι λέγουσιν<sup>14</sup>—Quidam fontes certo tempore purgamenta ejectione: ut Arethusa in Sicilia quinta quaque æstate per Olympia, inde opinio est Alphæon ex Achaia eo usque penetrare... ideoque iis diebus quibus Olympia sunt victimarum sterces secundo traditum flumini illic redundare. hoc et a te (Lucilius scil., whom he is addressing in this work) traditum est in pœmate, Lucili carissime, et a Vergilio<sup>15</sup>.\*

In the Latin idiom the term *lustrum* is frequently substituted for the

\* Hesychius, Ἀρέθουσα· κρήνη... καὶ ἐν Σικελίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ ὁ ἐν τῇ Ἡλίδι ῥέων ποταμὸς Ἀλφειδὸς ἀργύριον κομίζειν νομίζονται—Schol. in Theocritum, Idyll. i. 117. Ἀρέθουσα... ἢ Ἀρέθουσα κρήνη ἐν Συρακούσιν ἢ ἐν Σικελίᾳ, ᾗ φασὶ διὰ πελάγους Ἀλφειδὸν ἴκειν, ὡς φησὶν Ἰβυκος, παριστορῶν περὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπίας φιάλης—Antigonus Carystius, Ἴστορ. παραδόξ. συναγωγῆ, cap. clv: Ἀρέθουσαν δὲ τὴν ἐν Συρακούσιν, ὡς περὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φασὶ καὶ Πίνδαρος, τὴν πηγὴν ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν

<sup>7</sup> Cicero, De Oratore, iii. 32, 127.

<sup>8</sup> Suidas in voce.

<sup>9</sup> Isidore, Orig. v. 37. 41 H. cf. Prosper, Chronicon, 692 B, from which this was taken: also Isidore, De Natura Rerum, vi. 248 G: Orosius, ii. 4. ad princip.

<sup>10</sup> Lucian, i. 535. De Sacrificiis, 11. 99. cf. ii. 781. Icaro-Menippus, 24, 41. Yet, iii. 344, De Morte Peregrini, 20, he expresses the interval by Διὰ τεττάρων ἐτῶν.

<sup>11</sup> Schol. in Horat. ad Od. i. i. 3.

<sup>12</sup> Schol. in Lucanum, Phars. i. 294. Eleus sonipes. These Scholia were the work of a Christian, later than the time of Macrobius ii. 412, than the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, v.

384: than Boëthius, i. 641 &c.: and yet the Olympia seem to be here spoken of as if they were still continuing in the time of their author.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Scholia ad Olymp. iii. 38: x. 28. 68. 69: Nemea, xi. 30, &c. cf. also Eustathius in Iliad. B. 550. 283. 32: also Paræmiographi Græci, Zenobii Epitome, Centuria v. 49. 358, 359. (cf. 86. e Cod. Bodl. 713.) Οὐδὲ Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δύο.

<sup>14</sup> Aristot. Opp. ii. 847. 3 a. Περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων, 172.

<sup>15</sup> Seneca, Opp. v. 197. Nat. Quæst. iii. xxvi. 4. cf. Servius ad Virg. Eclog. x. 4: Æneid. iii. 694: Pliny, H. N. xxxi. 30. p. 607: Pomponius Mela, ii. 7. p. 61.

cycle of the Olympiad; though lustrum in Latin was properly a period of five years<sup>16</sup>—

Ut qui prima novo signat quinquennia lustrum  
Impleat innumeras Burrus Olympiadas<sup>17</sup>.

Vitæ modo carmen adultæ

Nectere tentabat juvenum pulcherrimus ille;  
Cum tribus Eleis unam triëterida lustris  
Attendit torvo tristis Rhamnusia vultu<sup>18</sup>.

Ovid has so expressed himself<sup>19</sup>; and sometimes even as if it was strictly a period of five years; as, for instance, in speaking of his age at his banishment, which we know from the testimony of other parts of his works was fifty<sup>19</sup>—

Jam mihi canities<sup>20</sup> pulsus melioribus annis  
Venerat, antiquas miscueratque comas.  
Postque meos ortus, Pisæa vinctus oliva,  
Abstulerat decies præmia victor equus:  
Cum maris Euxini positos ad læva Tomitas  
Quærere me læsi principis ira jubet<sup>21</sup>.

Elsewhere he speaks of it in the usual manner—

Par animus formæ: nec adhuc spectasse per annos  
Quinquennem poterat Graia quater Elide pugnam<sup>22</sup> †.

There are instances also in which the Olympic period is called a *τριετηρίς*, and the games are supposed to have been celebrated every *three* years<sup>23</sup>. It is most probable however that the text in these instances is corrupt. It is more to the purpose to observe that, according to the Scho-

Ἡλείαν Ἀλφειοῦ. διὸ καὶ ταῖς Ὀλυμπικαῖς ἡμέραις, ὅταν ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ ἀποπλύνουσι τῶν θυμάτων τὰς κοιλίας, οὐ καθαρὰν εἶναι τὴν ἐν Σικελίᾳ κρήνην ἀλλὰ βεῖν ὕψω. φησὶν δὲ καὶ φιάλην ποτ' εἰς τὸν Ἀλφειὸν ἐμβληθεῖσαν ἐν ἐκείνῃ φανῆναι. τοῦτο δ' ἴστορεῖ καὶ Τίμαιος. Of the age of this Antigonus, see Eusebius, Præp. Evang. xiv. 18. 504. 26.

† Cf. Martial—

Heu qualis pietas: heu quam brevis occidit ætas!  
Viderat Alphæi præmia quinque modo.  
vi. 85. 7.

Occidit illa prior viridi fraudata juventa,  
Hic prope ter senas vidit Olympiadas.  
vii. 40. 5, 6.

Jam numerat placido felix Antonius ævo  
Quindecies actas Primus Olympiadas.  
x. 23. 1.

<sup>16</sup> See our Origines Kalendarie Italicæ, ii. 255, note.

<sup>17</sup> Martial, iv. 45. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Statius, Silvæ, ii. vi. 70.

<sup>19</sup> Tristia, iv. 8. 33: x. 5. 6: Ibis, 1. Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony, iii.

374-381.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. De Ponto, i. iv. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Tristia, iv. x. 93.

<sup>22</sup> Metam. xiv. 324. De Pico.

<sup>23</sup> Etym. M. Ἡλῆις: Schol. ad Iliad. A. 686.

iii. Third Character of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic *Ferivæ*.

The third peculiarity of the Olympic Rule was the Olympic *Ferivæ*; i. e. the number of days for which the celebration of the games went on, the length of time for which the Olympia lasted. That the Olympic celebrity had its stated *term of days*, as well as its stated season, may be inferred from the following of Pausanias<sup>x</sup>: Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ὁδὸν πρὶν ἢ διαβῆναι τὸν Ἀλφειὸν ἐστὶν ὄρος ἐκ Σκιλλοῦντος ἐρχομένῳ, πέτραις ὑψηλαῖς ἀπότομον· ὀνομάζεται δὲ Τυπαῖον τὸ ὄρος. κατὰ τούτου τὰς γυναικας Ἡλείοις ἐστὶν ὠθεῖν νόμος, ἣν φωραθῶσι ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐλθοῦσαι τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν, ἣ καὶ ὅλως ἐν ταῖς ἀπειρημέναις σφισὶν ἡμέραις διαβάσαι τὸν Ἀλφειόν. And that this stated term was not less than five, may be collected from the exordium of the fifth Olympic Ode of Pindar, in honour of Psaumis of Camarina—

Ἄος τὰν σὰν πόλιν αἰῶνων,  
Καμάρινα, λαοτρόφον  
βωμοὺς ἐξ̄ διδύ-  
μοις ἐγέραρεν ἑορ-  
ταῖς θεῶν μεγίσταις  
ὑπὸ βουθυσίαις, ἀέθλων τε πεμ-  
πταμέροις ἀμίλλαις,  
ἵπποις ἡμιόνοις τε μοναμπυκί-  
α τε γ.

We may assume it therefore, as another well-attested character of the Olympic Rule, in the time of Pindar at least, that the number of the Olympic *Ferivæ* was not less than five; and, if in the time of Pindar, very probably from the first.

iv. Fourth Character of the Olympic Rule, the Calendar-dates of the Olympic *Ferivæ*, and their relation to the *Moon*.

With respect to this fourth character, first, the calendar-dates of the Olympic *Ferivæ*, (i. e. the days of the month on

lia on Plato<sup>24</sup>, Olympia (minora) were celebrated every year: "Ἦγετο δὲ καὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπερ ἐλάττω ἐκάδουν—a statement which we have met with nowhere else, and yet which may nevertheless have been true; unless it is to be understood of the Olympia at Athens, in the time of these Scholia.

<sup>x</sup> v. vi. 5.

<sup>γ</sup> Vers. 8. cf. the Scholia in loc.

<sup>24</sup> ii. 313: Phædrus, 20. 1 sqq.

which the games were celebrated,) and secondly, the relation of those dates to the *Moon*, (i. e. the *Lunar Characters* of the Olympic *Feræ*,)—a distinction like this, between the Calendar-dates of the games and the Lunar Characters of those dates, could have had no place, if the Olympia were celebrated from first to last only according to some solar character; nor yet, if they had always been celebrated according to some Lunar one which was constantly true to the moon: in which case there could never have been any difference between the calendar-dates of the *Feræ*, and the character which they derived from their relation to the moon. If then there was a time when the Olympia were celebrated according to a calendar of their own, which was not a lunar calendar, this distinction could not have been made between the calendar-dates and the Lunar characters of those dates respectively; and if they had always been celebrated according to such a lunar calendar as the Metonic correction, it would have been inapplicable also.

But if the Olympic *Feræ* were assumed and laid down at first in any such lunar and solar calendar as the octaëteric correction of Solon, then this distinction between the original calendar-dates of these *Feræ* and the original lunar characters of the same, and their nominal characters of the same kind, at any subsequent point of time, would speedily require to be taken into account. The calendar-dates might be continuing the same; but the original lunar characters of these dates would soon be found to have become different. From the time then of the foundation of the games down to the correction of Solon, this distinction between the calendar and the lunar dates of the Olympic *Feræ* might have had no place; but from the date of that correction, the first thing to be considered would be the *Lunar Characters* of the Olympic *Feræ*—whether they had a stated lunar date from the first or not—without the knowledge of which even their original solar dates, in such a lunar calendar as the octaëteric correction, could not be discovered.

Now with respect to the lunar characters of the Olympic *Feræ* from the time of Solon downwards, i. We learn from the *Scholia* on Pindar<sup>z</sup>, that in the proper Olympic calendar

<sup>z</sup> Olymp. iii. 35.

(which we may assume to have been that of Elis) there were two months, in each of which the games were liable to be celebrated; one of them called Apollonius, the other Parthenius\*. ii. It may be inferred from Xenophon<sup>a</sup>, that the Olympic Ferie did not commonly fall out at the beginning of their proper month, because (speaking of Ol. civ, B. C. 364, to which we referred supra<sup>b</sup>, as celebrated by the people of Pisa, instead of the people of Elis.) he distinguishes the arrival of the Olympic month from that of the stated days in that month: 'Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ τε μῆν ἦκεν ᾧ τὰ Ὀλύμπια γίγνεται, αἱ τε ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἢ πανήγυρις ἀθροίζεται κ', τ. λ. iii. It might be inferred from the testimony of the *vetus Scholiasta* on Pindar, that the proper lunar date of the games, at some period of their duration or other, was the full of the moon<sup>c</sup>: Τελεῖται γὰρ κατὰ πληροσέληνον . . . ἐν πανσελήμφ γὰρ ἐτέθη ὁ ἀγών. Consequently, if they lasted five days, they either began at the full, and ended five days after it, or began five days before the full, and ended at it: and, to determine which

\* It is a remarkable fact that, while so many allusions to the Olympic solemnity occur in classical antiquity, so little is found on record in the shape of direct testimony to its proper rule. Xenophon, as we have seen, mentioned the Olympic month, (Olymp. civ., B. C. 364,) and the Olympic Ferie in that month<sup>1</sup>, but neither the name of the former nor the date of the latter. The Olympic *Kairos* was referred to by Heraclides of Pontus, quoted by Athenæus<sup>2</sup>; and is alluded to by Athenæus himself, on the same occasion, with respect to a similar attempt by the people of Crotona<sup>3</sup>; but in neither of these instances is it explained what that *Kairos* was, and what relation it bore to the natural year. It is only from the Scholia on Pindar, late as these were as a compilation, that we learn the names of the Olympic months in the Elean or Olympic calendar, Parthenius and Apollonius; and only through Plutarch's Life of Alexander, and the old Macedonian calendar, that one of these was the same with Hecatombæon in the Attic calendar. In short, there is only one instance, of which we are aware, in which the Olympic month is directly specified in terms of the Attic calendar; and that too not free from ambiguity, inasmuch as the specified month is Munychion, which, as we shewed (Vol. ii. 166, Attic Julian Calendar), could not be explained except by supposing Munychion in this instance to be only another name for Skirrhophorion.

<sup>a</sup> Hellenica, vii. iv. 28.

<sup>b</sup> Page 488.

<sup>c</sup> Ad Olymp. x. (xi.) 90.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, vii. iv. 28.

<sup>2</sup> xii. 21. Cf. Geographi Minores, ii. Skymnus of Chius, 349.

<sup>3</sup> xii. 22.

of these was the actual state of the case, we must have recourse to the testimony of Pindar.

For, iv. the moon is alluded to in Pindar, in connection with the original institution and the first celebration of the games<sup>d</sup>—

Ἦδη γὰρ αὐτῷ  
πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἀγισθέν-  
των διχόμηνης<sup>e</sup> ὄλον χρυσάρματος  
ἔσπερας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε μήνα,  
καὶ μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν  
καὶ πενταετηρίδ' ἀμᾶ  
θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημοῖς Ἀλφειῷ.

And again, in reference to the same occasion<sup>f</sup>.

Ἐν δ' ἔσπερον ἔφλεξεν εὐώπιδος  
σελάνας ἔρατὸν φάος.  
αἰείδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος τερπναῖ-  
σι θαλίαις τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον.

And both these are clear descriptions of the full of the moon, as coincident with some period or other of this first Olympic celebrity; but as to what period, and whether at the beginning or at the end, the second of these allusions seems to be inconsistent with the first—the former apparently representing the moon as rising just when the games were beginning, the latter just when they were ending. For that the end is meant in the second instance is clear, both from the context previously, and from the allusion to the songs and other rejoicings supposed to be beginning simultaneously with the appearance of the full moon (i. e. in the evening) τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον, which, as the Scholiast observes, was strictly the conclusion of the solemnity, the contests being over, and nothing remaining to complete the ceremonies but the celebration of the success of the victors: Ἔθος δὲ ἦν κωμάζειν τὴν νίκην ἔσπερας τοῖς νικηφόροις μετ' αὐλητῶν, μὴ παρόντος δὲ αὐλητοῦ εἰς τῶν ἑταίρων ἀνακρουόμενος ἔλεγε Τήνελλα<sup>g</sup>—

<sup>d</sup> Olymp. iii. 33.

<sup>e</sup> Cf. the Schol. Recentiora, in loc.

<sup>f</sup> x. 90.

<sup>g</sup> Ad Olymp. ix. 1. cf. Schol. ad Acharn. 1228. Τήνελλα: ad Aves, 1762. Τήνελλα: Suidas, Τήνελλα. For other allusions to the ceremony of the Κῶμος see Olymp. iv. 10-21: vi. 29.

165: viii. 12: ix. 1-7: xi. 16: xiii. 39: xiv. 22. Pyth. iii. 130: iv. 1-5: v. 25-29. 141-143: vi. 19: viii. 25-28. 99: x. 6-10: xii. 7-12. Nemea, i. 8-10: ii. 37-40: iii. 6-9: ix. 1, 2. 119, 120. Isthmia, vii. 27: viii. 1-8: and the Scholia in loco.



ᾧ καλλίνικε χαῖρ' ἀναξ Ἡράκλεες,  
αὐτός τε κ' Ἴόλαος αἰχμάτα δύο—

Cf. Poetæ Min. Græci, Archil. Fragm. lx. 3.

And yet that there is really no inconsistency between these allusions will appear on a little consideration. The moon is described even in the first as rising only βωμῶν ἤδη ἀγισθέντων—i. e. after the altars had already been consecrated. And that is a description of the concluding ceremony of the games, and to the candidates, the most important of all; the proper denomination of which was the βωμῶν ἀγιστεία, or γεράρεια, or the θυσία, and the proper time was the last of the Olympic Feriæ, reckoned from evening, according to the Greek rule, when the contests being over, nothing remained but the adjudication of the prizes, and the triumphant rejoicings of the victors. The commentary of the old Scholiast *in loc.* will place this distinction in a clear light: Καὶ οἱ βωμοὶ τοῦ Διὸς θυσιῶν καὶ ἐναγισμάτων ἐπεπλήρωντο, καὶ ἡ σελήνη πλήρης οὔσα καὶ ὀλοκλήρῳ τῷ φωτὶ πρὸς τὴν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν νύκτα ἀντιλάμπουσα... τὸν καιρὸν παρεῖχε τῆς κρίσεως τοῦ ἀγῶνος. ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἑκκαιδεκάτῃ τῆς σελήνης ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγὼν τελεῖται. He adds, (still more clearly to mark the distinction in question,) Οὐ γὰρ δὴ θυσίαι ἐγένοντο πρότερον, εἶτα οὕτως ἡ διχόμηνις ἔλαμπει, ἀλλὰ πρότερον ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς πανσελήνου παρεγένετο, εἶτα οὕτως αἱ θυσίαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐτελοῦντο. And on the word διχόμηνις<sup>h</sup>, he observes, Ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ πανσελήνῳ ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἀγὼν ἄγεται, καὶ τῇ ἑκκαιδεκάτῃ γίνεται ἡ κρίσις.

We may conclude then from these explanations, that the Olympic celebrity lasted in strictness six days, five of them devoted to the games properly so called, the sixth to the adjudication of the prizes, to the sacrifices, and to the κῶμος of the conquerors. And that is still more plainly asserted in other parts of these Scholia—Πεμπταμέριος ἀμίλλαις<sup>i</sup>. Ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ πέντε ἡμέρας ἦγετο αὐτὰ τὰ ἀγωνίσματα, ἀπὸ ἐνδεκάτης μέχρι ἑκκαιδεκάτης (i. e. both inclusive)... ἡνίκα οὖν ἐτελείτο τὰ ἄθλα τῶν πενθημέρων ἀγῶνων ἐγέραιρε τοὺς βωμούς<sup>k</sup>—Ἦρχετο δὲ ἡ πανήγυρις κατὰ τὴν δεκάτην (corr. ἐνδεκάτην) τοῦ μηνός, καὶ ἐτελείτο μέχρι καὶ τῆς ἑκκαιδεκάτης ἐν ἧ τὰ ἄθλα ἐδίδοτο<sup>l</sup>—Ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ πέντε ἡμέρας ἐγένετο τὰ Ὀλύμπια, ἀπὸ 1' μέχρι 15' <sup>k</sup>—Ἐτε-

<sup>h</sup> Verse 35.

<sup>i</sup> Olymp. v. 14.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. the Schol. Recent. *in loc.*

<sup>l</sup> Ad v. 8.

λείτο δὲ ἡ Ὀλυμπιακὴ πανήγυρις ἐν πανσελήνῳ...μετὰ γὰρ τὴν πανσελήνου αἱ θυσίαι ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ, φασίν, ἐτελοῦντο<sup>m</sup>—Ἐπὶ πέντε ἡμέρας...ἐπὶ τοσαύτας γὰρ ἡμέρας ἐτελείτο ὁ Ὀλυμπιακὸς ἄγων<sup>n</sup>. So also Tzetzes<sup>o</sup>, Τὰ δὲ Ὀλύμπια πέντε ἡμέρας ἐτελείτο, ἀπὸ ἰαΐ τῆς σελήνης μέχρι ὄλης ἰεΐ.

With regard then to the fourth character of the Olympic rule, the actual state of the case, it now appears, was this: On the *eleventh* of the proper Olympic *month* (whether Apollonius or Parthenius,) as supposed to have been the same with the *eleventh* of the *moon*, the games began. On the *fifth* day after, (the *fifteenth* of the *month* and the *fifteenth* of the *moon*,) they ended. On the *sixth* day, reckoned from sunset, the *sixteenth* of the *month* and the *sixteenth* of the *moon*, the adjudication of the prizes, the sacrifices to the gods on the six altars\*, (the βωμῶν ἀγιστεία,) and the triumphal processions of the victors, all took place. It is clear then that, inclusive of this last ceremony, the solemnity lasted six days, and the

\* That there were six altars at Olympia, each of them sacred to two of the gods, appears from Olymp. v. 10, where Pindar describes them as βωμοὶ ἐξ δίδυμοι. The Scholiast ad ver. 7. observes, Οἱ γὰρ νικῶντες ἔθνον ἐν τοῖς ἐξ βωμοῖς. And ad ver. 10. he enumerates the six, and the pairs of gods to which they were respectively sacred, as follows<sup>1</sup>.

- |                         |                                |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| i. Zeus and Posidon.    | iv. The Charites and Dionysus. |
| ii. Hera and Athena.    | v. Artemis and Alpheus.        |
| iii. Hermes and Apollo. | vi. Kronos and Rhea.           |

This enumeration however is not always uniform. Pausanias at least gives a different account of the state of the case in his own time<sup>2</sup>.

It appears from Philostratus<sup>3</sup>, and the fact there related of Philostratus of Lemnus and Hippodromus, when both were at Olympia together, that the games still lasted more than one day, and that one day (apparently the last) was still called Ἡ τῆς θυσίας ἡμέρα. What occasion that was is uncertain, only that as some time in the reign of Antoninus Caracalla, A. D. 211—217, it must have been A. D. 213, the only Olympiad which could have been celebrated in his reign, as he died himself on the 8th of April, in the last year of this Olympiad, A. D. 217\*.

<sup>m</sup> Ad iii. 33. Schol. Rec.

<sup>n</sup> Ol. v. 8. cf. ad 10.

<sup>o</sup> Ad Lycoph. 40-43.

\* See the Vitæ, ii. 612 C. which says that when he met Hippodromus on that occasion at Olympia Philostratus was 22; and compare 618 B. when he was 24, in the reign of this Antoninus. If so, two years after the Olympia in question, A. D. 215, still in the reign of Caracalla.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also ad x. 50-59.

<sup>2</sup> v. xiv. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Vitæ Sophistarum, ii. 612 C, D. Hippodromus.

number of the Olympic feriæ must have been six. It is clear also that the lunar dates of these six *feriæ* were the *eleventh*, the *twelfth*, the *thirteenth*, the *fourteenth*, the *fifteenth*, and the *sixteenth*; that the rule was for the games, properly so called, to begin on the *eleventh* of the moon, and to end on the *fifteenth*, and the rest of the ceremony to be concluded on the *sixteenth*. It is clear also that, with such a peculiar rule, the first lunar dates of the Olympic *feriæ*, if true to the moon, must have been their proper dates of that kind ever after; and that in assuming and laying them down originally nothing could have been regarded but the true lunar characters of these feriæ, and therefore they must have been adjusted in the first instance to some lunar calendar, which at that time also was true to the moon.

SECTION V.—*On the relation of the Four Characters of the Olympic Rule to the different kinds of the Civil Calendar at different times in use among the Greeks.*

Among the four characteristics of the Olympic rule which have thus been ascertained, it is manifest that the first three, the Olympic Season, the Olympic Cycle, and the number of the Olympic Feriæ, in their own nature, would be indifferent to any form of the civil calendar, and therefore would be capable *a priori* of holding good in the solar, as much as in the lunar, calendar of Grecian antiquity. There is consequently no reason why it should not be supposed that these three held good of the Olympic Rule from the first, and, (as the ancients evidently assume,) were transmitted from the earliest to the latest times.

But with regard to the fourth, the case is different. It is self-evident that the Lunar Characters of the Olympic feriæ could have been derived only from the Lunar calendar. There can be no doubt too that the calendar in the time of Pindar was everywhere lunar: and even in that of the *Vetus Scholiasta*, (from whose testimony more particularly we learnt the fact of this one of the criterions of the Olympic feriæ,) it might have still been lunar everywhere also. It is certain therefore of this *one* character, that if the Olympic institution itself was older than the first lunar correction, and if it had only originally a proper rule of its own, it could

not have held good from the first. It is equally certain notwithstanding, that this fourth character has been handed down as just of the same antiquity, and equally as characteristic of the rule from the first, as any of the rest; and that none of the ancients, even those whose time comes nearest to the introduction of the lunar correction, appears to have even suspected that the character which the Olympic *feriæ* of his time derived from their relation to the moon, had not belonged to them from the first.

Now there is only one mode of accounting for this very general presumption of a state of the case, which, if the Olympic institution was really older than the Lunar calendar of the Grecks, and yet had a proper rule from the first, could not possibly have held good from the first; viz. by supposing that, when the solar calendar passed into the lunar, the proper dates of the Olympic *feriæ* in their own calendar, and according to their own rule, coincided with the six lunar terms from which they derived their characters in the lunar calendar. All having been transferred from their own calendar to the lunar, in this state of coincidence, both became at that time, and continued ever after, the same with the six lunar terms in question.

There are consequently *four* things, with regard to the Olympic rule, which have to be explained: i. Why the season of the games was attached to midsummer in the natural year. ii. Why the Olympic cycle was appointed to be a period of four years. iii. Why the Olympic *feriæ* were limited to six; and five of them devoted to the contests, the sixth to the adjudication of the prizes, and to the festivities which concluded the solemnity. iv. When, and how, it might have come to pass, that, as subject to all these conditions from the first, the observance was so falling out, at the time of the transition of the solar into the lunar calendar, that the same rule of the games, *mutatis mutandis*, might be as applicable to the latter as to the former—in other words, the preexisting rule of the games in the solar calendar might be adopted without any change in the lunar; and yet the Olympic *feriæ* derive those characters from the change, and from their relation to the moon, which distinguished them in the lunar calendar.

## CHAPTER II.

*On the Date of the Institution, the Date of the Restoration,  
and the Date of the Historical Commemoration  
of the Olympic Games.*

SECTION I.—*On the reputed authors of the Olympic  
Institution.*

There are three principal epochs in the history of the Olympic games—the epoch of their institution, the epoch of their reinstatement, and the epoch of their historical commemoration, i. e. from which they began to be registered and recorded. This last was the latest, but it is the best ascertained of all. The epoch of their reinstatement belongs to the æra of Iphitus and Lycurgus—but what *their* time was is still a subject of controversy. The epoch of their institution, for our particular purpose, is the most important: but as going the furthest back into antiquity, it is calculated *a priori* to appear the most uncertain.

Yet upon this question of the origin of the Olympic games, Hellenic tradition is so far uniform and consistent with itself, that it has handed down in an authentic shape two names only as those of the founders of the institution; that of the Pelops, and that of the Hercules of early Grecian history. For though other names also are upon record, as those of reputed founders of these games, (the Idæi Dactyli in general, or one of their number, called Hercules also, in particular—Aëthlius, Epeius, Clymenus, Endymion, Alexinus, CEnomaus, and the like<sup>p</sup>.) they may all be dismissed, either as those of persons who never had a real existence, or those of persons who might have had an historical existence, yet are tantamount to fictitious, as the supposed authors of the Olympic institution. Nor does the existence of such statements as these detract in the least degree from the

<sup>p</sup> Cf. Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 278 sqq.: Anecdota Græca Parisiensia, ii. 140. 21—141. 19: Syncellus, 368. 12—369. 3: Diodorus Sic. iii. 74:

Strabo, viii. 3. 173: Pausanias, v. i. 2, 3: viii. 1: vii. 4—viii. 3: Schol. ad Iliad. N. 307. Δευκαλίδη: Etym. M. Ἀθηῆσαι.

credibility of the contrary testimony, which unanimously ascribes the origin of the games to one or the other of these two, Pelops or Hercules.

The only historical characters then, between whose claims to be considered the authors of this memorable institution, (if it had a proper origin, earlier than the Olympiad of Co-ræbus, and earlier than that of Iphitus,) we have to decide, are these two, Pelops and Hercules. And with respect to the antiquity of the institution, it would make little difference to which of them it were to be attributed; because for some part of their lives respectively they must have been contemporaries. According however to the best of the judgment which we ourselves have been able to come to, the truth, briefly stated, is, that each in his proper order of time was the founder of the institution—that Pelops was the first founder, and yet Hercules was the founder too. In what manner that might have come to pass, and in what sense the authorship of the same institution may with equal truth be attributed to both, is what we must now proceed to explain.

SECTION II.—*On the personal history, and the chronology of the life, of Pelops.*

The testimonies of antiquity to the personal existence, the personal history, and the chronology of the life of Pelops, have been collected by the late Mr. Clinton<sup>q</sup>; to whom we refer the reader who is desirous to see them. We shall confine ourselves at present to one class of these statements only; those viz. which lead to the inference that, according to the tradition and belief of the Greeks, Pelops some time or other came to Greece from abroad, and settled there at the head of a colony of followers.

i.

Δάμπει

δέ οί κλέος παρ' εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ  
Πέλοπος ἀποικία<sup>r</sup>—

Τὸ δῆποτε Λυδὸς ἦρως  
Πέλοψ ἐξάρατο κάλλι-  
στον ἔδνον Ἰπποδαμείας<sup>s</sup>—

<sup>q</sup> Fasti Hellenici, i. pag. 80. 82 v :  
139.

<sup>r</sup> Pindar, Olymp. i. 36.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. ix. 14.

Υιὲ Ταντάλου σὲ δ' ἀντί-  
 α προτέρων φθέγξομαι,  
 ὅπότ' ἐκάλεσε πα-  
 τήρ ἐς εὐνομώτατον  
 ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,  
 . . . . .  
 τότ' Ἀγλαοτρίαναν ἀρπάσαι<sup>†</sup> κ', τ. λ.

Πίνδαρος τὸν Πέλοπα Λυδὸν φησιν εἶναι, Ἰστρος δὲ Παφλαγόνος, Ἀντεσίων Ἀχαιοῖν, ἀπ' Ὀλέου πόλεως, ἧς καὶ Ὀμηρος<sup>ν</sup> μνημο-  
 νεύει<sup>λ</sup>—Σίπυλον· οἱ μὲν πόλεως ὄνομα, οἱ δὲ ὄρος περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν  
 ὄθεν ὁ Πέλοψ γ.

ii. Οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἶη<sup>z</sup>.

iii. Ἀγχίμολον δ' ἐπὶ τῇ πολέας παρανεῖσθε κολωνούς  
 Παφλαγόνων· τοῖσιν τ' Ἐνετήϊος ἐμβασίλευε  
 πρῶτα Πέλοψ, τοῦ καὶ περ ἀφ' αἵματος εὐχετόωνται<sup>a</sup>—

Ἀπὸ Ἐνέτης, πόλεως Παφλαγόνων... τὸν δὲ Πέλοπα Παφλαγόνος  
 τὸ γένος εἶναι. ἄλλοι δὲ Λυδὸν αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦσιν. ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίων  
 ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς δόξαις συντίθεται<sup>b</sup>.

iv. Εὐρήσομεν γὰρ τοὺς Ἕλληνας δι' αὐτὴν (Helen and the Trojan  
 war) ὁμοιοῦσαντας κ', τ. λ. ἐξ ὧν τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἐτύχομεν ὥστε  
 τὸν μὲν ἐπέκεινα χρόνοι οἱ δυστυχοῦντες ἐν τοῖς βαρβάρους τῶν  
 Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων ἔρχειν ἠξίουσιν, καὶ Δαναὸς μὲν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου  
 φεγῶν Ἄργος κατέσχε, Κάδμος δὲ Σιδώνιος Θηβῶν ἐβασίλευσε,  
 Κῆρες δὲ τὰς νήσους κατόκου, Πελοποννησίου δὲ συμπάσης ὁ Ταν-  
 τάλου Πέλοψ ἐκράτησεν<sup>c</sup>—Λέγουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰ σαφέστατα Πε-  
 λοποννησίων μνήμη παρὰ τῶν προτέρων δεδεγμένοι, Πέλοπά τε  
 πρῶτον πλήθει χρημάτων, ἃ ἦλθεν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἔχων ἐς ἀνθρώ-  
 πους ἀπόρους, δύναμιν περιποιησάμενον τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τῆς χώρας  
 ἐπηλύτην ὄντα ὅμως σχεῖν, καὶ ὕστερον τοῖς ἐκγόνοις ἔτι μείζω  
 ξυνενεχθῆναι κ', τ. λ.<sup>d</sup>—Ἐτέροις δὲ ἔστιν εἰρημένον ὅσα ἐν τῷ  
 χαλκίῳ κείσθαι Ταντάλου. τὸν μὲν δὴ Θυέστον παῖδα ἢ Βροντέον,

<sup>†</sup> Ibid. i. 58.

<sup>ν</sup> Iliad. B. 639.

<sup>λ</sup> Schol. ad Olymp. i. 37.

<sup>z</sup> Ad Olymp. i. 62. cf. Diodor. Sic. iv. 74: Ovid, Metam. vi. 147. De Niobe: Pl. Ω. 614. The statue here described has actually been discovered in the same locality, of late years.

<sup>z</sup> Tyrtaeus, iii. 7. cf. Grote, History of Greece, i. 213: Κύπρια ἔπη δ'.

Διεδέρκετο νῆσον ἅπασαν  
 Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος.

<sup>a</sup> Apollonius Rhod. ii. 357. Speech of Phineus.

<sup>b</sup> Scholia in loc.

<sup>c</sup> Isocrates, x. 296. § 77. Ἑλένης ἐγκάμιον. cf. xii. 336. § 87. Panathenæicus.

<sup>d</sup> Thucydides, i. 9.

(λέγεται γὰρ ἀμφότερα,) ὃς Κλυταιμνήστρα πρότερον ἢ Ἀγαμέμνων συνώκησε, τοῦτον μὲν Τάνταλον οὐ διοίσομαι ταφῆναι ταύτη· τοῦ δὲ λεγομένου Διός τε εἶναι καὶ Πλουτοῦς<sup>e</sup> ἰδὼν οἶδα ἐν Σιπύλῳ τάφον θέας ἄξιον. πρὸς δὲ οὐδὲ ἀνάγκη συνέπεσεν ἐκ τῆς Σιπύλου φυγεῖν αὐτὸν, ὡς Πέλοπα ἐπέλαβεν ὕστερον, ἐλαύνοντος Ἰλλου τοῦ Φρυγὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν στρατεία<sup>f</sup>.

With respect to these statements, the opinion ascribed to a certain Autesion that Pelops was no stranger among the Greeks, but a native Greek, of Olenus in Achaia, mentioned by Homer, must be dismissed at once; as well as that of Istrus, (espoused apparently by Apollonius Rhodius,) that he came into Greece from Enete, a city of Paphlagonia. To judge from the rest of these testimonies, it must have been the common belief that Pelops, who came into and settled in that part of Greece which was called after him the Πελοπόννησος, or island of Pelops, came from Sipylus in Asia Minor, and was consequently a Lydian, and the leader of a colony from Lydia. And it is very important to observe, that such must have been the opinion of Pindar, the oldest authority, next to Homer, to which we could appeal on this point; who nowhere alludes to him, except as a native of Lydia, and as the leader of a colony of Lydians.

The above testimonies concur also in representing him as the son of Tantalus, likewise of Sipylus. Nor is there any reason why we should call in question this circumstance of his personal history in particular, or consider the tradition of antiquity less entitled to credit with respect to the name and country of the father of Pelops, than with respect to those of Pelops himself. Thus much therefore we may consistently believe, and on the faith of antiquity we are bound to believe, that Pelops was the son of Tantalus; that Tantalus and Pelops were both of Sipylus in the ancient Lydia; and that Pelops some time or other, and for some reason or other, left his own country and city, and migrated with a body of followers to Greece.

But with respect to the time of this migration, and its proper place in the personal history of Pelops; it must be admitted that the chronology of the life of Pelops is involved

<sup>e</sup> Cf. Schol. in Pind. Olymp. iii. 41.

<sup>f</sup> Pausanias, ii. xxii. 4 : cf. v. xiii. 1-4.



in great obscurity. Our own inquiries indeed, if they succeed in recovering the epoch of his Olympic correction, will establish a definite point of time at which he must have been both living and flourishing; but that will not necessarily be the date of his coming into Greece, though it could not be earlier than it. On this question however of the principal epochs in the life of Pelops, and of the opinions of the ancient chronologers concerning them, we again refer the reader to Mr. Clinton's elaborate work <sup>g</sup>. From the fundamental assumptions of the chronological system of Eratosthenes, the time of Pelops is there deduced about one hundred years before the capture of Troy, i. e. according to the same chronologer, before B. C. 1183; and therefore about B. C. 1283; and as this date, understood of that of his coming into Greece, appears to us to be remarkably near the truth; we beg to assume, as the basis of our reasonings on this point at present, that the probable year of the migration of Pelops was B. C. 1283, or about it.

It will follow from this assumption that B. C. 1283, or some other about that time, must have been the date of his marriage to Hippodamia, the daughter of the contemporary king of Pisa; the fact of which in general, and (as the ancients uniformly appear to have supposed) very soon after his coming, there is no reason to disbelieve; whether the circumstances traditionally connected with it in other respects can be considered credible or not. And if this was the date of his marriage, a year or two later might have been that of the birth of his eldest son, whose name has been handed down uniformly as that of Atreus. It is agreed that Pelops had many children, not fewer than *six* (all of them sons) according to Pindar <sup>h</sup>; as many as *fifteen*, according to the scholia on the Orestes <sup>i</sup>: but it is agreed that, whether more or fewer, the oldest of his sons was Atreus.

If this however was the date of the birth of Atreus, he would be 30, B. C. 1253 or 1252; and, according to the usual standard of the length of a generation, the birth of his *eldest* son, in like manner, might be B. C. 1253, or 1252.

<sup>g</sup> i. cap. iii. 72 sqq. : 139.

<sup>h</sup> Olymp. i. 144, and Schol.

<sup>i</sup> Ad vers. 5. cf. Mr. Clinton, F. H. i. 81 ω.

But with respect to this son—if it be supposed to have been Agamemnon; then Agamemnon, born, as we thus assume, B. C. 1253, or 1252, must have been 72 or 73 years old in the year of the capture of Troy, B. C. 1181: the mere statement of which conclusion is sufficient to convict the premises from *which* it is deducible of falsehood. The true date of the birth of Agamemnon therefore, as lineally descended from Pelops, could not have been so early as B. C. 1253, or 1252.

We have often had occasion to observe that the age of the different chiefs, who make a figure in the Iliad, in the last year of the war, according to Homer must have varied, with one or two exceptions, from 40 to 50; and as it is clearly implied that Agamemnon in particular, all through that Poem, must have been as young and active as any of them, (Achilles himself or Diomed not excepted,) it may be reasonably inferred from this fact, that in the last year of the siege of Troy he was probably little more than 40; and, therefore, if that year was B. C. 1181, must have been born B. C. 1221, or 1222. And this conclusion is confirmed by the account of himself which Homer puts into his mouth, in his address to Diomed<sup>k</sup>; from which we learn *two* things: i. That he himself had never seen, or could not remember he had ever seen, Tydeus, the father of Diomed. ii. That Tydeus notwithstanding visited Mykenæ in person, along with Polynikes, when they were both going about, soliciting aid in the first expedition against Thebes; and consequently if Agamemnon had been then alive, or old enough to take notice of anything, he must both have seen, and remembered to have seen, him.

Οὐ μὲν Τυδείϊ γ' ὤδε φίλον πτωσχάζεμεν ἦεν,  
 ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἐτάρων δηϊοισι μάχεσθαι,  
 ὡς φασαν οἱ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε  
 ἦντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.  
 ἦτοι μὲν γὰρ ἄτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκῆνας  
 ξείνος ἄμ' ἀντιθέφ' Πολυνείκειϊ, λαὸν ἀγείρων,  
 οἳ ῥα τότε ἔστρατόωνθ' ἱερά πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης·  
 καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους.  
 οἱ δ' ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπήνεον ὡς ἐκέλευον·  
 ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραΐσια σήματα φαίνων.

<sup>k</sup> Iliad. Δ. 372–381.

Now, the date of this first expedition, as we hope to see hereafter, was B. C. 1222; and therefore that of this visit must have been B. C. 1223, or 1224. On which supposition, it will follow that Agamemnon must either have been still unborn, B. C. 1223, or 1224, or still so young as not to be able to remember anything, 40 or 50 years after, which he had then seen. Consequently, if the eldest son of Atreus must have been born B. C. 1253, or 1252, it is clear that Agamemnon could not have been that son.

It is fortunate therefore, for the explanation of this difficulty, that, according to some of the ancients, Agamemnon was not the son of Atreus; only his *grandson*: and consequently that, between the birth of Atreus and that of Agamemnon, there might have been as great an interval as *sixty* years; and if the former is to be dated B. C. 1283 or 1282, the latter may require to be so B. C. 1223 or 1222—i. e. exactly as Homer gives us reason to date it, from the age of Agamemnon himself in the last year of the war of Troy.

Now though among the names of the sons of Pelops and Hippodamia, that of Pleisthenes sometimes occurs<sup>1</sup>; yet according to the best informed of the ancients Pleisthenes was the son of Atreus, and only the grandson of Pelops. It is added too, concerning this Pleisthenes, that having been naturally of a sickly constitution, (so much so that he was surnamed *ὁ ἀσθενής*,) he died at an early age, but not so young as that he must not have been married, and had two sons, Agamemnon and Menelaus, before his death: Ἀτρεὺς .. Κλεόλαν τὴν Δίαντος ἀγαγόμενος ἔσχε Πλεισθένη τὸ σῶμα ἀσθενῆ· ὃς Ἐριφύλην γήμας ἔσχευ Ἀγαμέμνονα καὶ Μενέλαον καὶ Ἀναξιβίαν. νέος δὲ τελευτῶν ὁ Πλεισθένης καταλείπει τῷ πατρὶ τοὺς παῖδας<sup>m</sup>—(Ἀτρεΐδαι) ἦσαν κατὰ μὲν τὸ σύνθηες Ἀερόπης καὶ Ἀτρέως παῖδες τοῦ Πέλοπος, τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ Πλεισθέ-  
ρους, ὡς φασιν ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ καὶ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς ζητήμασιν. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ Πλεισθένης νέος τελευτᾷ, μηδὲν καταλείψας μνήμης ἄξιον, νέοι ἀνατραφέντες ὑπὸ Ἀτρέως αὐτοῦ παῖδες ἐκλήθησαν<sup>n</sup>.  
And among those “many others,” distinct from Porphyry, we learn from another of these scholia<sup>o</sup>, that Hesiod was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mr. Clinton, F. H. i. 82 ω.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. ad Orest. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Schol. ad Iliad. B. 249.

<sup>o</sup> Ad Il. A. 7. Ἀτρεΐδης.

one—'Αερόπην ... ἔγημε Πλεισθένης, καὶ παῖδας Ἀγαμέμνονα καὶ Μενέλαον ἔτεκε P.

We thus learn that the Ἀτρεΐδαι of Homer, Agamemnon and Menelaus, were in reality the grandsons of Atreus, adopted and brought up by him after the death of his own, and as it seems, his only son, Pleisthenes. The necessity of the case requires two generations between the Birth of Atreus and the Birth of Agamemnon, if the age of the latter in the last year of the Trojan war could not much have exceeded *forty*; and this desideratum is supplied simply by the correction of the common opinion, grounded on the *prima facie* construction of the language of Homer, that the Atridæ were the sons of Atreus. And if Eratosthenes also really made the interval, between the coming of Pelops into Greece and the capture of Troy, one hundred years; he too could not have supposed there were fewer than three generations between that coming and the capture; which three must have been those of Atreus, Pleisthenes, and Agamemnon, or Pleisthenes, Agamemnon, and Orestes.

Again, from Homer's account of the Σκῆπτρου παράδοσις, it may be inferred that Agamemnon must have been a minor at the death of Atreus: for which reason the *sceptre* (i. e. the kingdom) was bequeathed by him to Thyestes his brother, (for Homer knew nothing of the monstrous fiction of the later poets, the unnatural quarrel between Atreus and Thyestes, its causes, and its effects,) to be held by him, as regent, in trust for Agamemnon. And at the death of Thyestes it was transmitted accordingly to Agamemnon.

Ἄνὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων  
ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων, τὸ μὲν Ἕφαιστος κάμε τεύχων.  
Ἕφαιστος μὲν δῶκε Διὶ Κρονίῳ ἀνακτι'  
αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε διακτόρω Ἀργειφόντῃ'  
Ἑρμείας δὲ ἄναξ δῶκεν Πέλοπι πληξίππῳ'  
αὐτὰρ ὁ αὖτε Πέλοψ δῶκ' Ἀτρέϊ ποιμένι λαῶν'  
Ἀτρεὺς δὲ θνήσκων ἔλιπε πολύαρνι Θυέστῃ'  
αὐτὰρ ὁ αὖτε Θυέστ' Ἀγαμέμνονι λείπε φορῆναι,  
πολλῆσι νήσοισι καὶ Ἀργεῖ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν<sup>q</sup>.

Now, according to Eusebius<sup>r</sup>, and the authorities followed

P Apollod. Biblioth. iii. ii. 2. cf. also  
Dietys Cretensis, De Bell. Troj. i. 1.  
q Iliad. B. 100. cf. the schol.

r Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 263; ii. ad ann.  
818: cf. Jerome ad ann. 820: Syncell.  
320. 16.

by him. Agamemnon reigned 30 years; yet Troy was taken in his 18th year: and that being impossible, consistently with the literal construction of the statement relating to the length of his reign, if he himself perished immediately after his return to Greece—Mr. Clinton<sup>s</sup> justly observes, that these 30 years must have taken in the regency of Thyestes, as well as the reign of Agamemnon; i. e. the whole interval from the death of Atreus to the death of Agamemnon. On which principle, the former must have happened about B. C. 1211, when Atreus himself might have been 71 or 72 years of age; but Agamemnon not more than 12 or 13.

We may therefore, without any violence to antecedent probability, or contradiction of any known fact, arrange these dates conjecturally as follows.

	B. C.
The coming of Pelops into Greece, and his marriage to Hippodamia .. .. .	1285 or 1284
The birth of Atreus .. .. .	1283 or 1282
The birth of Pleisthenes .. .. .	1253 or 1252
The birth of Agamemnon .. .. .	1223 or 1222
The death of Atreus, and the regency of Thyestes ..	1212 or 1211
The death of Thyestes, and the beginning of the reign of Agamemnon .. .. .	1201 or 1200

For, as the war of Troy (the Trojan expedition, at least, from the first commencement of the preparations for it to the capture of Troy) lasted 19 years complete, it must have begun to be set on foot B. C. 1200; and the reign of Agamemnon, which had begun before that, could not have borne date later than B. C. 1201 or 1200.

These considerations, in our opinion, do much to confirm the date of the coming of Pelops which Mr. Clinton has proposed on the authority of Eratosthenes, B. C. 1283—whose conclusions to that effect would be perfectly compatible with the true date of the same event, a year or two earlier. And if we may assume that he was then a young man, and, as Pindar supposes, in the flower of his age, (between 25 and 30,) he must have been born between B. C. 1310 and 1315. And this conclusion may be confirmed even by the fable which has been handed down concerning him soon after his birth itself, viz. that he was served up when an infant by Tantalus

<sup>s</sup> F. H. i. 81, note.

his father, at Sipylus his native place, as a repast for the gods. We need not hesitate to reject this fable, as the invention of later times; but it should be remembered that, whosoever the authors of it must have been, they might have lived so much nearer to the actual time of Pelops than any of the later Greeks, that very possibly they were in possession of data which enabled them to determine the most circumstantial points in the personal history of Pelops—the date of his death, and his age at the time—and therefore even the date of his birth.

Now the most observable particular in the traditional account of this incident is that when he was thus set before the gods by Tantalus his father, as if to try their divinity, the deception was detected by all his guests except Demeter: and consequently, while none of the rest tasted of the flesh of Pelops, Demeter in particular ate a part of the shoulder—which, having been thereby lost, was replaced by a shoulder of ivory.

Humeroque Pelops insignis eburno t—

Μόνην δὲ τὴν Δήμητραν τῶν κρεῶν ἀγνοίᾳ μεταλαβεῖν λέγουσι, τινὲς δὲ τὴν Θέτιδα . . . ὁ δὲ Βακχυλίδης τὸν Πέλοπα τὴν ῥέαν λέγει ὑγιάσαι, καθεῖσαν διὰ τοῦ λέβητος<sup>v</sup>. And though the explanation of this inadvertency on her part does not here appear, Tzetzes, the author of the Scholia on Lycophron, had met with it somewhere or other; and tells us it was owing to her being out of her mind at the time, from grief for the loss of the Κόρη, and therefore incapable of attending to anything:

<sup>^</sup> Ὀν δὴ δις ἠβήσαντα<sup>x</sup>—

Μόνη δὲ Δήμητρα οὐκ ἔγνω, διὰ τὸ μεμνημένοι αὐτὴν διὰ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῆς Κόρης· ὅθεν λαβοῦσα τὸν ὀμοπλάτην ἔφαγε.

It seems then that this adventure in the life of Pelops coincided critically with the acme of the distress of Demeter, for the Raptus: and as the date of that was B. C. 1311 or 1312—a year or two before the institution of the mysteries, B. C. 1310<sup>y</sup>—this banquet at Sipylus must have been going on B. C. 1311 or 1312; and consequently if Pelops was then not more than one or two years old, he must have been born B. C. 1312 or 1313: exactly as we have already seen reason

<sup>t</sup> Georgica, iii. 7. and the Comm. of Servius. <sup>v</sup> Scholia ad Olymp. i. 36.

<sup>x</sup> Lycophron, 152.

<sup>y</sup> See supra, vol. iv. 210.

to date his birth. And as it cannot be considered improbable *per se* that he might live to be 70; if he was born B. C. 1313, the year of his death might be B. C. 1244. This year would be Olympic, reckoned from any well-authenticated date of that kind we please—as for instance from B. C. 776. There was a very general tradition among the Greeks, that the Olympic games were celebrated at the funeral of Pelops, by Hercules his grandson. And though there may be reason to doubt whether the funeral solemnities of Pelops were celebrated by Hercules, and not rather by Atreus, there is none to call in question the tradition that by whomsoever celebrated, it was in the shape of the Olympic games: and if so, as we hope to see hereafter, this very year, B. C. 1244.

We shall therefore conclude what we have to say on these subjects at present, with some general observations. i. It is a singular coincidence, that not only the tradition of antiquity, but our own inquiries, (confirmed by a kind of proof peculiar to themselves, and wheresoever it is applicable little less than infallible,) conspire to authenticate the fact of migrations from Egypt—under Cadmus, B. C. 1317, under Danaus, B. C. 1316, under Erichthonius, B. C. 1312, and under the Umbrians, B. C. 1310; and of one from Phœnicia, B. C. 1330. That four of these (and very probably a fifth, which settled at Colchis in the Euxine sea,) should have come from Egypt, might be due to a cause which, as we have shewn<sup>a</sup>, might have been operating there at the time, and peculiar to Egypt; but that three of these themselves, and the colony from Phœnicia besides, which became the nation of the Arcadians in the Peloponnese, should have been directed alike to Greece, in our opinion, can be explained only by the fact that Græcia Proper, at this time, whether Bœotia, Attica, or the Peloponnese, was still comparatively unoccupied, and the Grecian nation, notwithstanding what the later Greeks may have supposed to the contrary, was still *in cunabulis*. It cannot therefore justly be considered extraordinary that a colony from Asia Minor under Pelops should have settled there also; or if the tide of migration was at the flood in that direction, B. C. 1317–1330, that it might not yet have reached its lowest point by B. C. 1285. Minos was a contemporary.

<sup>a</sup> Supra, page 128 sqq.

and even an ὀμηλικός, of Pelops; and if Minos could lead a colony from any quarter to Crete in or about B. C. 1260, so might Pelops to the Peloponnese in or about B. C. 1285.

ii. The proper name of the people of Lydia in the time of Pelops was that of the Mæonians; and yet the name of Lydians had so long before the time of Pindar superseded that of the Mæonians, that it can be no difficulty, if even Pelops himself in most of the statements, collected supra<sup>b</sup>, is called the Lydian. This leads us however to observe, that the name of the Lydians bears date in history only from the time of the migration to Italy, out of which the nation of the Tyrrhenians or Etrurians sprang up in that country. Now there are two remarks which may be made on that migration: i. That, according to Herodotus, the moving cause of it was a famine in Mæonia of long duration, which left the nation no alternative but that of dividing itself into two halves, one of which, under Tyrrhenus the son of Atys, was to go abroad, and the other under Lydus, his brother, to remain at home. ii. That, according to the traditionary belief of the Etruscans themselves, the origin of the *Nomen Etruscum* in Italy did not go much further back than B. C. 1220<sup>c</sup>. Now there is a wide difference between this date, and that of B. C. 1285, which we have assumed as that of the coming of Pelops into Greece—too great to allow of the supposition that the latter could have been the effect of the same cause which produced the migration of the Etrurians. And this is explained by the fact recorded by Pausanias<sup>d</sup>, if it may be depended on; that the migration of Pelops from Sipylos to the Peloponnese was not caused by any distress from within at the time, (a plague, or a scarcity,) but by danger from without—an invasion by Illus the Phrygian—which probably means Ilus, the son of Dardanus, the Trojan, who must have been a contemporary of Pelops.

Lastly, it has been seen in our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*<sup>e</sup>, that, according to the national tradition of the Sabini of ancient Italy, they too were of Grecian extraction—and some time or other came into Italy from the Peloponnese—and even from Sparta in the Peloponnese. And the date of

<sup>b</sup> Page 510.

<sup>c</sup> See our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*, ii. 564–581 n.

<sup>d</sup> Page 512.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. ii. 388 sqq.



the second type of the Nundinal calendar, peculiar to the Sabines, is demonstrative that their antiquity in Italy did not stop short of B.C. 1220 at least<sup>f</sup>, and very probably went a good deal further back. Here then the tradition, to which also we have more than once had occasion to refer<sup>g</sup>, respecting the Saturnus of ancient Italy, and his reception among the Prisci Latini, and their neighbours the Sabines, as soon as he had been dispossessed by Zeus of his hereditary jurisdiction in Crete, comes in to illustrate the real antiquity of the Sabini in Italy. For this loss of Crete by the Saturnus of Italic mythology, as we have seen<sup>g</sup>, was to be dated B. C. 1260, in the very year of the innovations of Minos, both in the preexisting system of religion, and in the preexisting system of time, in Crete. And though the Prisci Latini, as we have seen reason to conclude<sup>g</sup>, as a colony from Latus in Crete, could not have settled in Italy before B. C. 1260, the Sabini were already settled there, and had been some time, before their arrival. The migration of the Sabini to Italy, if they originally came from the Peloponnese, might have been due to the coming of Pelops thither from Mæonia, B.C. 1285: and it is obvious to remark that, if the migration of the Prisci Latini from Latus in Crete to Italy was the ultimate consequence of the coming of Minos to Crete, in or before B. C. 1260, it was equally possible and equally probable *a priori* that the coming of Pelops with a large body of followers into the Peloponnese might have a similar effect on some part of its inhabitants previously, in compelling them to seek a new home elsewhere. We should thus account for the national tradition of the origin of the Sabini in Italy, if they were of this number, and both shew there might always have been a foundation for it in the matter of fact, and that if any such event as this migration so produced ever took place, its date would be agreeable to that of the rise of the Nomen Sabinum in Italy, assigned it by their own traditions.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. ii. 394 sqq.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. i. 374. cf. supra Vol. iv. 563.

SECTION III.—*On the Foundation of the Olympic Solemnity; and whether it is to be ascribed to Pelops, or to Hercules.*

It may be taken for granted that if the Olympic institution was really older than the Olympiad of Corœbus, and the Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus, it cannot stop short of the time of Hercules, or the time of Pelops. It must be ascribed to one or the other of these two<sup>h</sup>. For though, as we have already observed<sup>i</sup>, many other persons are found on record as the authors of these games, they are fictitious and fabulous, either in themselves, or in connection with this institution. It may be taken for granted therefore that, according to the opinions of the best informed of the ancients, and the general concurrence of Hellenic tradition, one of these two, Pelops or Hercules, must have been the founder of the Olympic solemnity.

And this being the case, as we also observed<sup>i</sup>, it would make little difference to the antiquity of the institution, or to the proper Olympic date, or to the proper Olympic rule, and its true characters and criterions from the first, to which of them it might be attributable; because, for part of their lives at least, they must have been contemporaries, and if the Olympic institution was not older than both of them, it might have fallen out in the lifetime of each. But that the real founder of the games must have been Pelops, besides the deference due to the amount and authority of the testimonies to that effect, which are still in existence, may be argued from a number of general considerations, and various matters of fact connected with the institution, which could not be explained and accounted for on any other supposition.

i. If the Olympic games were really founded by Hercules, (i. e. had no existence in any form, or under any name, before the time of Hercules,) it would be difficult to discover a reason for their having ever been attributed to Pelops; but even though they had been really founded by Pelops, that they might possibly come to be ascribed to Hercules is very

<sup>h</sup> Cf. Pausanias, v. viii. 1 sqq. : Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 265. 276 : ii. Ad Ann. 701 : Jerome, Chron. ad Ann. 622 : Anecdota Græca Paris.

Excerpta Historica, ii. 136. 25 : Syncellus, 234. 20-235. 18 : 303. 1-11 : Malala, iv. 84. 17.-85. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Supra, 509.

conceivable. It would be abundantly sufficient to explain such an ascription, that these games were the most illustrious of their kind among the Greeks; and Hercules was the most illustrious of the national heroes, or worthies, among the Greeks also. And if, by whomsoever founded in reality, it was only known or believed that they were founded in the time of Hercules, nothing would be more probable *a priori*, than that in the course of time they would be attributed to him. It is far from improbable that the renown even of Hercules himself was much greater with posterity than among his own contemporaries; for though, in deference to the unanimous belief and testimony of classical antiquity, both Grecian and Roman, we cannot doubt of the actual existence of such a person in his proper order of time, nor that he must have been an extraordinary character; yet the marvellous adventures and exploits of the Hercules of classical antiquity must after all be set down to the invention of later times. And the natural tendency of these fictions being to exaggerate his credit beyond all reasonable bounds; it is not surprising, that nothing illustrious, nothing extraordinary, should be supposed to have happened in his time, in the doing of which he was not concerned—nothing at least so remarkable in itself, and so memorable and permanent in its consequences, as the Olympic institution.

ii. According even to the common tradition, concerning the institution of these games by Hercules, they were first celebrated, and by him, as funeral games in honour of Pelops: and while such a tradition proves that he and Pelops must have been contemporaries, it proves also, in our opinion, that the games were really the institution of Pelops. For, admitting the substantial truth of the tradition that these games were actually celebrated as the funeral solemnities of Pelops, what does that imply, but that the games were in existence before the death of Pelops? and were in course, according to their own rule, at the time of the death of Pelops. And though this may appear to require an extraordinary coincidence, between the time of the death of Pelops, and the Olympic season; such a coincidence was not impossible, and if the tradition had any foundation in truth, must have been a matter of fact: for the tradition itself supposes

it. Assume then as we may the truth of the tradition that the Olympic games were celebrated, and by Hercules, at the funeral of Pelops, that would be no account of the origin of the Olympic institution. It would not account for the Olympic cycle, for the repetition of the same games, ever after, if they were merely celebrated for the first time over the funeral pile of Pelops. The games of Acastus, Ἐπὶ Πελίᾳ, and the games of Achilles, Ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ, were celebrated under similar circumstances, as funeral solemnities, and yet they were never repeated. But the Olympic games were cyclical from the first. The first Olympic solemnity, whensoever it took place, neither was intended to be, nor was, an isolated act of its kind, which both began and ended in itself. These games therefore might have been celebrated Ἐπὶ Πέλοπι, and by Hercules; but if they were, it must have been in the course of their proper cycle, and in conformity to their proper rule: and consequently that cycle and that rule must have been older than the funeral of Pelops. And this would be entirely agreeable to the tradition that they were instituted by Pelops; but impossible, if they were first celebrated after his death.

iii. If Pelops was not the author of the institution, it would be difficult to account for the fact of the games having been founded at Olympia, in the territory of Pisa, and so near to that city; still more so to explain why the people of Pisa should have had the charge of these games at first, about which there seems to have been little doubt in ancient times, or on what grounds, after having so long ceased to exercise this privilege *de facto*, they should have reclaimed it, and made so many attempts to recover it. All this would be consistent, and just what might have been expected *a priori*, if the real founder of the games was an ancient king of their own; but not otherwise. No city, nor community, of ancient Greece, except the city and the people of the founder, could have had originally any connection with the institution; none but they could have exercised the right of presiding over, and administering, the games in the lifetime of the founder; none else with any show of reason could have laid claim to it after his death. In our opinion, this claim of the people of Pisa, so often advanced in aftertimes, and so

generally allowed on its own merits even by those who, under the change of circumstances in other respects which had taken place, doubted of the expediency of restoring to them their original right, is decisive of the question, which could have been the actual founder of the Olympic games—Pelops so closely connected with Pisa, or Hercules, who never had any connection with Pisa in particular, more than with any other part of the Peloponnese.

iv. If Hercules, not Pelops, was really the founder of the games, it was to be expected that some special distinction would be assigned to the memory of Hercules, at Olympia; especially from the time of the revival or reconstruction of the solemnity in the time of Lycurgus and Iphitus, who, it might be supposed, would have had every inducement to pay due honour at the games to the memory of such a founder as Hercules, Lycurgus being himself one of the Heraclidæ, and Iphitus a lineal descendant of Oxylyus, their companion in arms, if not their leader and guide, in their only successful attempt at returning. It is not conceivable therefore, if Hercules was known or believed in the time of Lycurgus and Iphitus to have stood to the Olympic institution in the relation of author and founder, that they should either have sanctioned or appointed the transfer of the honours due to him in that capacity to any other person; and yet the fact is certain, (at least from testimony,) that even at Elis, and when the administration of the games had passed into the hands of the Eleans, either out of deference to an usage and prescription older than the reforms of Iphitus and Lycurgus, or by virtue of an express constitution of theirs, the honours, which in the natural course of things must have been considered to belong only to the founder of the institution, were rendered to the memory of Pelops, not of Hercules.

Among the ceremonies of the Olympic solemnity we read of no distinction accorded to Hercules, except a sacrifice to Ἡρακλῆς ἀπὸ μνῆος—which implies nothing of his personal relation to the games in particular. According to Pausanias also <sup>k</sup> there was an altar, and a sacrifice, at Elis, to one of

the Idæan Dactyli called Hercules—but not to Hercules the son of Alcmena. With regard to Pelops, on the contrary, the estimation in which his memory was held at Elis, and the honours which continued to be paid to him there, especially at the Olympic solemnity, are demonstrative that he only must have been known of there as the founder of the games; and his right to the honours of the founder, especially at the times and seasons of the celebrity itself, must have been so clear and incontrovertible, so generally acknowledged and allowed, that neither Lycurgus and Iphitus, when they were founding the games afresh, nor the Eleans, in their frequent disputes with the people of Pisa, ever thought of calling them in question.

Pausanias tells us<sup>l</sup> it was the duty of the magistrates at Elis in the ordinary course of their official year, (*οἱ κατὰ ἔτος τὰς ἀρχὰς ἔχοντες*,) to do sacrifice to Pelops, and that in the comparative estimation whether of gods or of men, at Olympia, Pelops took precedence of the rest of the Heroes, as naturally as Zeus of the rest of the gods<sup>m</sup>: *Ἡρώων δὲ τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοσοῦτον προτετιμημένος ἐστὶν ὁ Πέλοψ ὑπὸ Ἡλείων, ὅσον Ζεὺς θεῶν τῶν ἄλλων.* And according to the scholiast on Pindar<sup>n</sup>, the stated sacrifice to Pelops there, by the appointment of Hercules, preceded that to Zeus: *Καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἡλείους θύειν, τοῦ Ἡρακλέους πρῶτον κατὰ τιμὴν τοῦτο πεποιηκότος*: which, if true, plainly implies that Pelops was the founder of the games, even in the opinion of Hercules himself. According to the argument of the Isthmia, the Olympic games were dedicated to Zeus *Διὰ τὸν Πέλοπα*, i. e. because Pelops was the son of Jupiter; not because Hercules was so—as might have been expected, if Hercules, who was universally believed to have been the son of Zeus, was known or believed to have been the founder of the games also.

It appears from Pindar, and from the first allusion to this subject which occurs in his Odes, that Pelops was buried in the midst of the racecourse at Olympia; and that Parentalia (*αἵμακουρία*), or *ἐναγίσματα*, were offered to his manes there, with every recurrence of the solemnity: which gave

<sup>l</sup> v. xiii. 2.<sup>m</sup> Ibid. 1.<sup>n</sup> Ad Olymp. i. 149.

occasion to some of the scholiasts to observe that it was doubtful whether the supposed burial-place of Pelops at Olympia was not rather a shrine or altar than a tomb<sup>o</sup>—that sacrifices at least were offered to him upon it—from which we must infer that he was recognised by the Eleans, at such times, not only as an hero, but as a god—as deified and entitled to divine honours.

Νῦν δ' ἐν αἰμακουρίαις  
 ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται,  
 Ἄλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθεῖς,  
 τύμβον ἀμφίπολον  
 ἔχων πολυξενωτάτῳ πα-  
 ρὰ βωμῶ· τὸ δὲ κλέος  
 τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀ-  
 λυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις  
 Πέλοπος, ἵνα ταχυ-  
 τὰς ποδῶν ἐρίζεται  
 ἄκμαί τ' ἰσχύος θρασυπόνοι P.

On which the Scholiast: *Τινές φασι μνήμα, ἄλλοι ἱερὸν, εἶναι τοῦ Πέλοπος, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Διὸς κ', τ. λ.* And again<sup>q</sup>: *Τὸ μνήμα τοῦ Πέλοπος τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ βωμῷ. οὐ γὰρ ἐτέρωθι μὲν ὁ Πέλοψ ἐτέρωθι δὲ ὁ βωμὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ χωρίον ἐστὶ σῆμα καὶ βωμὸς.*

It appears too that a statue stood on this tomb, as on a pedestal; and that too, as it was commonly believed, the effigy of Pelops himself: *Καὶ φασι τὸν ἐστῶτα παρὰ τῷ Πέλοπος αὐτοῦ βωμῷ Πέλοπα εἶναι, ἔνθα αὐτῷ τὰ ἐναγίσματα γίνεται<sup>r</sup>.* We learn too from the same Scholiast<sup>r</sup>, that the races took place round this tomb: *Οἱ δρομεῖς εἰς τὸν τάφον τοῦ Πέλοπος ἔκαμπτον:* and as the statue, standing there, was a very conspicuous object, it was liable to terrify the horses, and often did so: from which circumstance it acquired the name of *Ταράξιππος*—and Pelops also, from this statue, supposed to be his: *Ταράξιππος· οὕτως ὑπ' ἐνίων ὁ Πέλοψ ἱστορεῖται, οὗ τάφος ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ<sup>s</sup>\**.

\* There can be little doubt that the primary application of this title of the *Ταράξιππος* of the Olympic race-course must have been to the statue, and through that to Pelops, represented by the statue. Dio Chrysostom however, in a later allusion to it, speaks of it as if it was an image and a

<sup>o</sup> Cf. Olymp. ad i. 149: xi. 29.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. i. 146.

<sup>q</sup> Ad xi. 29.

<sup>r</sup> Ad i. 150 and 149.

<sup>s</sup> Hesychius: cf. Pausanias, vi. xx. 8, for various explanations of this statue.

Laying therefore these several facts together, we cannot hesitate to infer from them that the founder of the Olympic games, recognised in the ceremonial of the games themselves, and in every way in which the true founder might be expected to be recognised, must have been Pelops. And yet it may still be true that Hercules also, in some sense or other, was the founder likewise; if at least the Olympia, from the time of Hercules downwards, were anything different from what they had been until then. We reserve however the ex-

title of Posidon<sup>1</sup>: 'Ἐστὶν Ὀλυμπίαισι κατὰ μέσον τὸν ἵππόδρομον Ταραξίππου Ποσειδῶνος βωμὸς, ἔνθα μάλιστα συνέβαινε τοὺς ἵππους προείσθαι, καὶ πλείστα διαφθείρεσθαι τῶν ἀρμάτων. ἔδοξεν οὖν τοῖς Ἡλείοις ὡς δαιμονίου τινὸς ὄντος ἰδρύσασθαι βωμόν. καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν φασὶν ἀπ' ἐκείνου γεγονέναι τὸν τόπον ἀσφαλῆ. Lycophron also, describing the first Olympia, supposed to have been those of Hercules, and the contest in wrestling between him and Zeus, speaks of it as the tomb of the giant Ischenus—

‘Ο δεύτερον τεκοῦσαν ἄτρωτον βαρεῖ  
τύψας ἀτράκτω στέρνον, ἔν τ' αὐλῶ μέσῳ  
πατρὸς παλαιστοῦ χερσὶν ὀχμάσας δέμας,  
Κρόνου παρ' αἰπὺν ὄχθον, ἔνθα γηγενοῦς  
ἵππων ταρακτῆς ἔστιν Ἰσχένου τάφος<sup>2</sup>.

On which Tzetzes: Ἐρμού καὶ Ἱερείας υἱὸς Γίγας. Γίγαντος δὲ υἱὸς Ἰσχενος. λιμοῦ δὲ γεγονότος, ἐδόθη χρησμός μὴ ἂν ἄλλως λυθῆναι τὸν λιμὸν εἰ μὴ τῶν εὐγενῶν τυθῆ τις. πάντων τοίνυν ἀπορουμένων, ἐθέλησεν ὁ Ἰσχενος τυθῆναι. οὐ καὶ τυθέντος ὁ τάφος δείκνυται περὶ τὸν καλούμενον Κρόνιον λόφον, πλησίον τοῦ καμπτήρος τῆς Ὀλυμπίας. καὶ τιμαῖς πλείσταις αὐτὸν ἐτίμων καθ' ἡν ἡμέραν ἐτύθη, καὶ ἀγῶνας συνίστων. λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὸν Ταραξίππον, ἐπειδὴ ἔστι ταρασσῶν καὶ θορυβῶν τοὺς ἵππους ἀγωνιζομένους . . . καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸν Ταραξίππον, ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἀγωνιζόμενοι ἵπποι ὅταν γένωνται ἐκείσε ταρασσονται.

The subject of this legend however, under this name of Ischenus the giant, was Pelops himself; the legend being manifestly founded partly on the tradition relating to the moving cause of the Mæonian migration, partly on the fact in his personal history, reported by fable, his having been some time sacrificed. And, in further illustration of this fable, as well as of the supposed connection of Pelops himself with Pisa or Elis, we may observe that, according to Pliny<sup>3</sup>, the *ivory* rib of Pelops was preserved for a time at Elis: Et Elide solebat ostendi Pelopis costa, quam eburneam adfirmabant. Pausanias also<sup>4</sup> tells a curious story of his ὤμοπλάτη or *shoulder-blade*, kept originally at Pisa; which, having been sent to Troy, and on its way back again lost at sea, was recovered by a wonderful accident, and ultimately deposited at Elis—though, from exposure to the sea, and the effect of time, it had disappeared even there before Pausanias' time.

<sup>1</sup> xxxii. 691. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Ver. 39.

<sup>3</sup> H. N. xxviii. 6.

<sup>4</sup> v. xiii. 3.



planation of this point for a future opportunity; and will take our leave of this subject by assuming, as the result of these various considerations, that the absolute epoch of the Olympic institution must go back to the time of Pelops.

SECTION IV.—*On the original idea of the Olympic Institution, as deducible from the Characters of the Olympic Rule.*

These two preliminary questions, (one that of the probable time of Pelops, the other that of the first author of the Olympic institution.) being thus disposed of; we may now resume the consideration of the Olympic Rule and its characters, in later times. These characters were *four* in number; The Olympic Cycle (a period of four years), The Olympic Feriæ (a term of six days), The Olympic Season (that of mid-summer), and the Lunar characters of the Olympic Feriæ (the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth of the Lunar month).

We have assumed that these characteristics of the Rule in later times, *mutatis mutandis*, held good of that of former; and we know that this must have been the case with two of them, the Olympic cycle and the Olympic season, long before the transition of the old solar calendar into the lunar of later date: and there is no reason to suppose that (allowing for the difference between the same dates in a solar and a lunar calendar respectively) it was not the case with the other two. And this being assumed, we may reason from the assumption as follows.

i. With respect to the first and second of these characters, the Olympic Cycle and the Olympic Feriæ, it has often occurred to modern chronologers to suspect that the Olympic cycle was a Julian one; and though no one hitherto has been able to assign any proof of that fact beyond the *prima facie* evidence of the Olympic rule itself, every one must admit that it is *a priori* in the highest degree probable. The first two of the Olympic characters, the best ascertained of all, lead directly to that inference. The Olympic cycle was a period of four years; the Julian cycle of leap-year is a period of four years also. The Olympic ferie were a term of *six* days; the epagomenæ of the Julian year, as derived from the equable slightly modified, were a term of six days too. No one

can deny that these things are critically in unison with each other. No one could say that the first and proper idea of the Olympic rule, in these two principal and most characteristic of its peculiarities, was not derived from that of the Julian cycle of the leap-year and the leap-day; and was not purposely intended in imitation of it. Such coincidences as these cannot reasonably be resolved into chance.

ii. With regard to the second of these characters in particular; it has been seen that the precise state of the case in the use and application of the Olympic feriæ was *this*—The first *five* were devoted to the contests; the *sixth* to the adjudication of the prizes, to the solemnities in honour of the gods, and to the rejoicings, triumphal processions, and songs of the victors. Now this state of the case is competent to imply a marked distinction between this sixth day and the preceding five, and to designate it not only as the *last* day, but as the *principal* day, the *high* day, the *acme* and consummation of the solemnity. And that would be exactly the kind and degree of distinction which, in the adaptation of the Epagomenæ of the Primitive solar year to a Julian one, derived from it, and having at stated times six epagomenæ instead of five, might be expected *a priori*, between the first five of these Julian Epagomenæ and the sixth, the day which made all the difference between the Primitive equable year and the Julian—the intercalary day as such, the day which came in, in its place, in the calendar only once in four years. It was to be expected *a priori* that this last day of the six Julian Epagomenæ, all of them devoted to a certain purpose in common, would be found distinguished from the rest by something special and peculiar, though arising out of that common relation to something else in general.

iii. We observed *supra* <sup>t</sup>, that Ὀλυμπιάς in Greek, and the cycle of the Julian leap-year, after a time appeared to have come to be considered as the same idea, merely differently expressed; and though it must be admitted that this idiom begins to characterise the style of ancient chronology only after the Julian correction of the dictator Cæsar, there is a passage in Syncellus, from which it may be inferred that,

<sup>t</sup> Page 496 note.

among the Egyptians, who from time immemorial had various forms of the Julian year in use among them<sup>v</sup>, and probably knew more of the theory and constitution, of the end and design, of the Olympic cycle of the Greeks from the first, than we can know at present—*Ὀλυμπιάς*, in the sense of an Olympiad, was understood to be equivalent to the cycle of the Julian leap-year: *Οὐκ ἄμουσον δ' ἂν εἴη*, says he<sup>w</sup>, *καὶ τὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις περὶ τῶν τετραετηρικῶν Ὀλυμπιάδων εἰνοῖαι, ἄλλην τιὰ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις οὖσαν, ἐν βραχεῖ δηλώσαι τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν. ἡ γὰρ σελήνη παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις κυρίως Ὀλυμπιάς καλεῖται, διὰ τὸ κατὰ μῆνα περιπολεῖν τὸν ζωδιακὸν κύκλον, ὃν οἱ παλαιοὶ αὐτῶν Ὀλυμπον ἐκάλουν. αὕτη γὰρ κ', τ. λ.\* πληροῖ οὖν ὁ ἥλιος ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι μᾶ τετραετηρικῇ ἡμέρας, αὐξάν', ἡ δὲ σελήνη τυχήμερα, αὐξ', ὥρας ιά', λεπτὰ κθ', σελήνιον ἐν (corrigere σελήνια μῆ) καὶ ἡμισυ. ἐν δὲ Ὀλυμπιάσι δύο γίνονται σελήνια ζθ' (99) τυχήμερα δὲ β' γκβ', ἃ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τοῖς ἡ ἔτεσι. καὶ τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων δόξα περὶ Ὀλυμπιάδων.*

Now whether the ancient Egyptians gave the name of *Ὀλυμπος* to the zodiac or ecliptic, and the name of *Ὀλυμπιάς* to the moon, before they became acquainted with the Olympic institution of the Greeks, we cannot undertake to say. We will observe only that the epithet of *Ὀλυμπιάς*, and in this sense, is applied to the moon by Nonnus also, an older writer than Syncellus, and himself an Egyptian, and intimately conversant with the doctrines of the Egyptians in all such respects as these.

*Οὐρανόθεν δοκούντες Ὀλυμπιάς ὅτι Σελήνη  
γηγενέος Κύκλωπος ἐπαντέλλουσα προσώπω  
πλησιφαῆς ἤστραπτε, προασπίζουσα Λυαίου<sup>x</sup>.*

It is plainly however implied by this statement that they gave the name of an *Ὀλυμπιάς* to four revolutions of the mean Julian year, and reckoned the Octaëteric cycle of the Greeks as the same with two of these Olympiads. And this implies that they knew the Olympic cycle to have been from the first the cycle of the Julian leap-year; and that it did

\* What follows is merely a description of the octaëteric cycle.

<sup>v</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 481, 482.

<sup>w</sup> Pag. 370. 18—371. 13. Cf. *Anecdota Græca* Paris. ii. 374. 1.

<sup>x</sup> xxviii. 230.

not lose its nature as such, when the Olympiads began to be celebrated in the Octaëteric correction of later date.

iv. With regard to the fourth character of the Olympic Rule, the lunar characters of the six Olympic Feriæ in the lunar calendar of aftertimes; it has been seen that the character of the *first* was the lunar *eleventh*, and that of the *sixth* the lunar *sixteenth*. Now, if we may assume that the calendar, which regulated the solemnity from B. C. 592 downwards, was the same with the Attic one of Solon, then in the first year of the correction of Solon, (Cycle i. 1.) B. C. 592, which was Olympic in the regular course of the cycle (Olympiad xlvii), it will be seen from our Tables<sup>v</sup> that the eleventh of the Attic Skirrhophorion and the eleventh of the Elean Parthenius, (one of the regular Olympic months in the calendar of Elis,) were both falling on June 25, and the sixteenth, on June 30—all the rest of the Olympic Feriæ between the two. It follows that, just at the time of the transition of the solar calendar into the lunar at Elis, B. C. 592, the proper dates of the six Olympic Feriæ were these six Julian terms, from June 25 inclusive to June 30 inclusive. And if it may only be assumed that these proper dates in their proper calendar, at this time, were the proper dates, under the same circumstances, at all times before, it will follow that these six Julian terms, from June 25–June 30, must have been the proper Julian dates of the Olympic Feriæ in their proper calendar from the first—and the first of them, June 25 itself, must have been the Julian epoch of the Olympic institution.

Now this Julian term, June 25, being assumed as the epoch of the institution accordingly; in the first place it explains the first of the characters of the Olympic Rule, the Olympic *Season*, midsummer in the natural year. There can be no doubt that a solemnity, attached to such a Julian date as June 25, may be considered to have been attached to the season of midsummer, not only in the time of Solon, but in that of Pelops—and at every intermediate point of time between them. The first confirmation therefore of this epoch is the light which it reflects on one of the best authenticated of the characteristics of the Olympic solemnity, its relation

<sup>v</sup> Vol. iii. Appendix, Table i. vol. vi. Appendix, Table ii.

to the natural year. It was originally attached to this Julian term, and through that to the season of midsummer; and it never ceased to be attached to the former, nor consequently to the latter, down to the time of Solon at least.

This however is not all which distinguishes this particular Julian term as the epoch of an institution and observance like the Olympic. This Julian term of June 25 had also a peculiar relation to one of the most remarkable and most interesting of the conceptions of antiquity, which could not fail to have been known to Pelops, or to any educated person of his time. It was the Julian date of the summer solstice in the sphere of Mazzaroth; the first idea of which in theory, and the first realisation in effect and practice, were due to the ancient Egyptians, and both synchronised with the institution of their Phœnix cycle, B. C. 1847 z. The proper date of the Krión of Mazzaroth according to the Phœnix rule, (i. e. the Egyptian,) was March 24 at noon; according to the Primitive, was March 24 at 18 hours; according to the Julian, was March 25 at midnight: and on the same principle, that of the Karkinon of Mazzaroth, the proper summer-solstitial date in the sphere of Mazzaroth, according to the Phœnix rule, was June 24 at noon, according to the Primitive, June 24 at 18 hours, according to the Julian, June 25 at midnight<sup>a</sup>—the very term which appears to have been selected as the epoch of the Olympic institution. At this stage of our inquiries therefore nothing further is necessary to explain this choice, and to confirm our reasonings concerning this epoch hitherto, except the knowledge of another *fact*, viz. that the Olympia of Pelops were originally instituted in honour of the sun, and dedicated to the sun; and therefore were purposely attached to this date, as the fittest in the whole year, which could have been selected as proper for the sun. And concerning *that* fact something will be said by and by.

These various coincidences cannot be accounted for by merely supposing a fortuitous concurrence of circumstances. It could not have been an accidental coincidence, that the Olympic cycle, and the cycle of the Julian leap-year, should have been *de facto* the same—that the six Olympic ferie

<sup>z</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 199 sqq. Dissertation xv.

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 305.

should have been exactly the number of the Epagomenæ of the equable year, transformed by the addition of one into those of the Julian—that the sixth of these feriæ, in its place and order, should have been the most remarkable of all, as the leap-day, or intercalary day, of the Julian year is in the cycle of the Julian Epagomenæ—that the Olympic solemnity itself should have been intended in honour of the sun, and yet only *per accidens* have been attached to the season of midsummer, when the power and influence, the light and heat, of the sun attain to their culminating point, and to the summer-solstitial date itself, in so remarkable a division of the ecliptic, and of the natural year, as the sphere of Mazzaroth.

SECTION V.—*On the Equable and Julian date of the Olympic Institution of Pelops, Epagomene 1, Æra cyclica 2742, June 25, B. C. 1264.*

From the premises thus established, i. That the Olympic year of Pelops must have been a Julian one, and the Olympic cycle of Pelops a Julian cycle, ii. That this Julian year must have been derived from the Primitive equable year, and *mutatis mutandis* the same with it (i. e. made up, like it, of twelve months, each 30 days in length, and of a certain number of Epagomenæ, or additional days), iii. That the Olympic Feriæ must have been the six Epagomenæ of this Julian year, iv. That the stated date of the first of these Feriæ in the first year of their proper cycle was June 25; from these premises we say, it appears to us to be not only a *legitimate* but a *necessary* inference, that the date of the Olympic Institution itself must have been precisely that point in the constant decursus of primitive equable, along with proleptic Julian, time, both noctidiurnal and annual, from the beginning of things, when the first of the Epagomenæ of the primitive equable year was falling on June 25 at midnight, and the first of the primitive Thoth on June 30 at midnight—in the lifetime of Pelops himself. We say in the *lifetime* of Pelops himself: for that is an important distinction. In the lifetime of a given individual such a coincidence as this might have happened *once*; but if it actually did happen once, it could not possibly have happened again. The cycle of such coincidences, at the least possible estimate

of its magnitude, was a period of 1461 equable years, 1460 Julian : and in reality, down to a certain point of time from the beginning of things, was something considerably more. It is manifest therefore that as referrible to the lifetime of a particular individual, the chances of a coincidence like this between a given equable term and a given Julian one *a priori* would be very precarious ; and to find any such coincidence, as the necessity of the case may require, in a given instance, within such narrow limits as those of a single human life, compared with the decursus of a Period like this, could be accounted for by no consideration *a priori*, by nothing but the actual matter of fact.

It is therefore a remarkable confirmation of all our reasonings on this point, that if we examine our Tables of the decursus in question, from the first year of each description of time downwards, the first instance of the coincidence of which we are in search (that of the first of the primitive Epagomenæ with the Julian June 25, at midnight) occurs *Æra Cyclica* 1233 *exeunte*, A. M. 1233, B. C. 2772 ; and the next to that, *Æra Cyclica* 2742 *exeunte*, A. M. 2741, B. C. 1264 ; the former, long before the time of Pelops, the latter, critically in the midst of the Period, B. C. 1313 to B. C. 1214, within which we have seen reason on distinct and independent grounds to circumscribe his birth, and his death, and the principal events of his life. This consideration alone is competent to determine the coincidence of which we are in search to *Æra Cyclica* 2742 *exeunte*, A. M. 2741, B. C. 1264. None else could possibly have happened in the lifetime of Pelops.

It is further to be observed in reference to this point, that the proper epoch of the Olympic institution must have had a definite relation from the first, not only to the proper year of its own cycle, but also to the proper year of the Julian one, relatively to the Olympic. The proper Olympic cycle was not commensurable with the proper Julian one ; the first year of the former was the second of the latter, and the first of the latter was the fourth of the former. There was consequently only *one* year in the proper Julian cycle of leap-year in which the coincidence, necessary to fix the Olympic institution to its proper year in the lifetime of Pelops, *a priori*

was capable of being discovered, and *that* the *second*, dated from midsummer, like the first of the Olympic cycle.

We see from our Tables that the first year in his lifetime, which could have exhibited this coincidence, is that which has just been pointed out, *Æra Cyc.* 2742 *exeunte*, when the first Epagomene was falling on June 25, B. C. 1264, at midnight. But we may observe also that the same coincidence, and under exactly the same circumstances, was again holding good four years later, *Æra Cyclica* 2746 *exeunte*, B. C. 1260, when the first of the Epagomenæ, at midnight, was again falling on June 25, at midnight. This case however of a double coincidence of this kind, within a given interval of four years, both in the equable and in the Julian reckoning of noctidiurnal and annual time, was possible only of the last four years of one of our periods of either kind of time; and *Æra Cyc.* 2742–2743, and B. C. 1265–1264, were each the 108th year of the decursus of our xxiind period, and *Æra Cyc.* 2746–2747, B. C. 1261–1260, was the first of that of our xxiiird.

The explanation of this phenomenon has been given in the Prolegomena to our *Origines Kalendarie Italice*<sup>b</sup>; and may be easily comprehended by any one who will be at the pains to read it. It is however a necessary consequence of the state of the case in the present instance, that there would seem to have been *a priori* equal reason for fixing upon either *Æra Cyc.* 2742 *exeunte*, B. C. 1264, or *Æra Cyc.* 2746 *exeunte*, B. C. 1260, as the true date of the Olympic Institution; and it is manifest that either of these would have come within the lifetime of Pelops; either would be consistent with all that is known of his personal history; either would serve as the epoch of a regular series of Olympic cycles, according to one and the same rule, from *his* time to that of Solon, B. C. 592. It is evident too that the real antiquity of the institution would be almost the same in either case. Yet notwithstanding, there are many critical reasons, as we hope to see by and by, which render this seemingly trifling difference of four years only, between these two possible epochs of the same institution, in the present instance, something which is strictly

<sup>b</sup> Page xliv. sqq. See also the Prolegomena prefixed to these *Origines Kalendarie Hellenice*, from sect. xix. to the end.



to be taken into account, and will lead to the conclusion that the true date of the institution could have been only the earlier of the two.

The conclusion then to which we may come on this question is *this*, that the actual date of the Olympic institution of Pelops was *Æra Cyclica 2742 exeunte*, B. C. 1264, when the first of the Epagomenæ of the primitive equable year, reckoned by the Julian rule of the noctidiurnal cycle, was falling on June 25 at midnight. It follows, that if Pelops was born about B. C. 1313, the institution must have fallen out about the 50th year of his age; and if he came into Greece about B. C. 1285, it must have been 21 years later than his coming. And in that case it must be self-evident that the institution could not have arisen simply out of the fact of his coming, or out of his marriage to Hippodamia, or out of any consideration which was personal to himself. As to the interval between his first arrival and the actual date of the institution, it would not affect the truth of that date, whether we could explain it or not. And though various other reasons might possibly be assigned for it, we are entirely of opinion the true account of it is to be found in the final end of the institution itself, as designed in honour of the sun, and in the nature of the date which must be assigned it with such a relation, viz. the date of the summer solstice in the calendar of Mazzaroth, June 25, as well as the first Epagomene in the primitive equable year. *Æra Cyclica 2721 exeunte*, when Pelops came into Greece, the first Epagomene was falling on June 30, and it would require *twenty* years before it could begin to fall on June 25. So long therefore would it be necessary to wait, before Pelops could carry the idea of such an institution as the Olympic into execution, even though already conceived at the time of his settling in Greece.

SECTION VI.—*Confirmation of the date of the Olympic Institution of Pelops by other and distinct arguments.*

We shall now proceed to confirm these conclusions by some distinct arguments. And the first and most important observation which may be made is *this*; That though Pelops is commonly spoken of by the ancients as the founder of the Olympic games, if as the founder of games of *any* kind at all,

and though the games ascribed to him in particular are invariably styled the Olympic, there is good reason to believe that no such games, or at least under any such name, were actually founded by Pelops; that the games which *he* founded, at the time and under the circumstances which have just been explained, were in honour of Cronos, and, as was naturally to be expected from such a relation, were called CRONIA at first, not Olympia.

i. That there was an ancient observance among the Greeks, which was called *Κρόνια*, and consequently derived its name from *Κρόνος*, and must have been dedicated to him, does not admit of a question. We have had occasion more than once to refer to it, as something which had an actual existence *c*. If the treatise *De Vita Homeris*, ascribed to Plutarch, may be believed, there were *Κρόνια* at Thebes in the time of Homer<sup>d</sup>; and Plutarch himself alludes to the ordinary celebration of a feast so called among his countrymen, as much as the Dionysia, in his own time *e*. There was a feast of the same name in the Attic calendar from the time of Solon downwards. The Greek *Κρόνος* corresponded to the Latin Saturnus, and these *Κρόνια* of the Greeks, in point both of etymon and signification, were the counterpart of the Latin Saturnalia; and the Roman grammarians and antiquarians themselves were led by the perceptible resemblance of the two institutions to derive their own Saturnalia from the Grecian *Κρόνια*<sup>f</sup>.

The existence therefore of this national observance among the Greeks may be taken for granted; and also that, if it was called the *Κρόνια*, it must have derived its name from *Κρόνος*. And *Κρόνος* being much older, according to the Greek Theogonia itself, than Zeus and the rest of the Olympic gods, who were represented in that Theogonia as the children of Cronos; it is self-evident that if Pelops was older than the oldest of these gods of Olympus, he could not possibly have been the founder of an institution in honour of any one of the Olympic gods, but he might have been of one in honour of *Κρόνος*. The *Κρόνος* of Crete was forty years older than the Zeus of Crete; and the Zeus of Crete was 25

<sup>c</sup> Vol. ii. page 507. also supra, vol. v.  
231.

<sup>d</sup> Cap. iv.

<sup>e</sup> Non posse suaviter, &c. cap. xvi.  
cf supra, p. 36.

<sup>f</sup> See Vol. ii. 507.

years younger than the coming of Pelops into Greece. The Olympic Zeus therefore could not yet have been heard of in Greece before Pelops founded his games, whatsoever they were: but the Κρόνος of Crete might even then have been well known. The supreme object of reverence among the Greeks, the contemporaries of Pelops, might have been Κρόνος, but it could not yet have been Zeus. It is clear then that an institution in honour of the Olympic Zeus, of the date of this of Pelops, must have been an impossibility; but not one in honour of Κρόνος.

ii. It appears from the descriptions of the site of the ancient Olympia, (i. e. the locality where the Olympic games were celebrated,) that one of its most characteristic features was a natural eminence, of great size and height, which stood in the midst of the plain on which the games took place, and consequently looked down upon them, commanding a view on every side. It appears too that the name of this eminence was the Κρόνιος λόφος, the Κρόνιον ὄρος, the hill of Kronus. And it appears to us only a natural inference from these facts, that the contests of every kind, which were celebrated beneath and round about this hill, must have been dedicated to Kronos too—that *their* name must have been that of the Κρόνια, just as the name of this hill was that of the Κρόνιον—that the presiding genius at these games must have been he, under whose eyes they were thus supposed to be celebrated perpetually, the Κρόνος who resided upon and gave its name to the hill in question. Let us however produce some of the testimonies of antiquity, both to the existence of such an hill, and so called at Olympia, and to its proper relation to Κρόνος, as well as to its connection with the games celebrated at Olympia.

i. De Hercule.

Ἄλτιν μὲν ὄγ' ἐν καθαρῷ  
διέκρινε κ', τ. λ.  
τιμάσας πόρον Ἀλφειῷ  
μετὰ δώδεκ' ἀνάκτων θεῶν. καὶ πάγον  
Κρόνου προσεφθέγγετο· πρόσθε γὰρ  
νόνημνος ἄς Οἰνόμαος ἄρχε  
βρέχετο πολλὰ νιφάδι ε' κ', τ. λ.

Τινὲς φασιν ὡς πρὸ τοῦ τὸ δωδεκάθειον τὸν Ἡρακλέα ποιῆσαι

Κρόνιος ἐκαλεῖτο λόφος, διὰ τὸ Κρόνου ἱερὸν ἐνταυθοῖ εἶναι. ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσι, μεθ' ὧν καὶ Πίνδαρος, ὡς ἔρημος ἦν ὁ χῶρος, Ἡρακλῆς δὲ τὸ δωδεκάθεον κτίσας Κρόνιον λόφον τὸν τόπον ὠνόμασεν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπερέχοντος. ὁ γὰρ Κρόνος πατὴρ τῶν θεῶν<sup>h</sup>—

Παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν

Κρόνιον<sup>i</sup>—

Τὸ δὲ Κρόνιον ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Πίσσης· περὶ γὰρ τὸν Κρόνιον λόφον ἄγεται τὸ Ὀλυμπία<sup>k</sup>—

Ἄλλ' ὃ Κρόνιε παῖ ῥέας<sup>l</sup>—

Οὐ μόνον ὅτι Κρόνου παῖς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Κρόνιος λόφος καλεῖται ὁ ἐν Ὀλυμπία<sup>m</sup>—

Ἄλλ' οὐ κατὰ δένδρε' ἔθαλλε

χῶρος ἐν βάσσαις Κρονίου Πέλοπος<sup>o</sup>—

Ὅτι ὁ χῶρος τοῦ Πέλοπος ὁ ἐν ταῖς βήσσαις τοῦ Κρονίου οὐδέπω εἶχε τὸ φυτόν. Κρόνιον δὲ ὄρος πλησίον<sup>p</sup>—Ἀρίσταρχος...λόφος δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν Ὀλυμπία ὁ καλούμενος Κρόνιος<sup>p</sup>—

Οἶα παίζομεν<sup>q</sup>—

Πίσσα δὲ ἐκλήθη...ἐλέγετο δὲ ὁ τόπος τοῦ ἀγῶνις καὶ Πίσσα καὶ Κρόνιος λόφος<sup>r</sup>—

Σωτήρ ὑψινεφές Ζεῦ,

Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον,

τιμῶν τ' Ἀλφεὸν

εὐρὸν ῥέοντ', Ἰδαί-

όν τε σεμνὸν ἄντρον<sup>s</sup> κ', τ. λ.

Κρόνιον ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Πίσσῃ, ἱερὸν τοῦ Κρόνου<sup>t</sup>—

Ἴκοντο δ' ὑψηλοῖο πέ-

τραν ἀλίβατον Κρονίου<sup>v</sup>—

Παρεγένετο δὲ εἰς τὴν ὑψηλὴν πέτραν τοῦ Κρονίου<sup>x</sup>—Τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπία λόφον φησὶν<sup>x</sup>.

Ἄλκιμέδοντα δὲ παρ Κρόνου λόφῳ

θῆκεν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν<sup>y</sup>—

Οἱ δὲ, ὅτι ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος ἐκεῖνο Κρόνος ἰδρύνθη<sup>z</sup>.

Δύο μὲν

Κρονίου παρ τεμένει<sup>a</sup>—

<sup>h</sup> Schol. Rec. ad xi. 61.

<sup>i</sup> Olymp. i. 178.

<sup>k</sup> Schol. ad i. 179.

<sup>l</sup> Olymp. ii. 22.

<sup>m</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>o</sup> Olymp. iii. 40.

<sup>p</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>q</sup> Olymp. i. 24.

<sup>r</sup> Schol. Rec. in loc.

<sup>s</sup> Olymp. v. 39.

<sup>t</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>v</sup> Olymp. vi. 109.

<sup>x</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>y</sup> Olymp. viii. 22.

<sup>z</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>a</sup> Nemea, vi. 104.

Καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολῶν ἄχθῳ Κρόνου<sup>a</sup>—

Ἄντὶ τοῦ καὶ τῷ λόφῳ τῷ κατὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν ἀνιερωθέντι τῷ Κρόνῳ<sup>b</sup> \*.

ii. Παράκειται δὲ ὄρος Κρόνιον καλούμενον ἀπὸ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. μετὰ τὴν Γίγαντομαχίαν Κρόνος, τὰς Διὸς ἀπειλὰς ἐκκλίων, εἰς ὄρος παρεγένετο Κτοῦρον. ὃν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κρόνιον μετωνόμασαν<sup>c</sup>— Ἐς δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν λέγουσιν Ἡλείων οἱ τὰ ἀρχαιότατα μνημονεύοντες, Κρόνον τὴν ἐν οὐραῖῳ σχεῖν βασιλείαν πρῶτοι, καὶ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ποιηθῆναι Κρόνῳ γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων, οἳ ὠνομάζοντο χρυσοῦν γένος. Διὸς δὲ τεχθέντος ἐπιτρέψαι ῥέαν τοῦ παιδὸς τὴν φρουρὰν τοῖς Ἰδαίοις Δακτύλοις, καλουμένοις δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τούτοις καὶ Κούρησιν· ἀφικέσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐξ Ἰδῆς τῆς Κρητικῆς, Ἡρακλέα, καὶ Παιωναῖον, καὶ Ἐπιμήδην, Ἰάσιόν τε καὶ Ἰδαίον. τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλέα παίζοντα (εἶναι γὰρ δὴ αὐτὸν πρῆσιζύτατον κ', τ. λ.) Ἡρακλεῖ οὖν προσέειπε τῷ Ἰδαίῳ δόξα τόν τε ἀγῶνα διαθεῖναι πρῶτον, καὶ Ὀλύμπια ὄνομα θέσθαι. διὰ πέμπτου οὖν ἔτους αὐτὸν κατεστήσατο ἄγεσθαι, ὅτι αὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πέντε ἦσαν ἀριθμόν<sup>d</sup>—Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῷ λόφῳ (the Collis Saturnius at Rome) τινὲς μὲν ὥσπερ ἐφήν ἀρχαῖον οἴονται εἶναι, καὶ αὐτῷ τοῦς Ἐπειοὺς οὐχ ἥκιστα φιλοχωρῆσαι τῷ λόφῳ, μνήμη τοῦ ἐν Ἰλιῶν Κροίῳ λόφου, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Πισατίδι γῆ. ποταμοῦ πλησίον Ἀλφειοῦ· καὶ αὐτὸν ἱερὸν τοῦ Κρόνου νομίζοντες Ἰλλεῖοι θυσίαις καὶ ἄλλαις τιμαῖς συνιόντες γεραίρουσιν ἐν ὠρισμένοις χρόνοις<sup>e</sup> †.

\* From none of these allusions does it appear that Pindar supposed this hill to have had any relation to Zeus; though he himself repeatedly applies to Zeus the patronymic *Κρονίων*, derived from *Κρόνος* also<sup>1</sup>, and was well aware that the games, from the time of Hercules to his own, were dedicated to Zeus. We are entitled to argue from this fact that the tradition, which derived the name of this hill from its relation to *Κρόνος*, and connected both with the celebrity from the first, was too authentic, too generally received, to be disturbed, notwithstanding the *prima facie* inconsistency that the games themselves should be supposed to have belonged to Zeus, and yet the locality where they were celebrated to have been sacred to *Κρόνος*, and to have derived its name from him as its proper genius and guardian.

† One of these, as we are told by Pausanias<sup>2</sup>, was a stated sacrifice to

<sup>1</sup> Olymp. ii. 22: Pyth. i. 137: iii. 101: iv. 40: Nemea, i. 23: ix. 44. 66: x. 142.

<sup>2</sup> vi. xx. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Nemea, xi. 31.

<sup>b</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>c</sup> Geographi Minores, ii: Plutarchus, De Fluviiis, 39. Alpheus.

<sup>d</sup> Pausanias, v. vii. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Dionysius Hal., Ant. Rom. i. 34.

iii. Though there is no reason to suppose that the months in the primitive calendar had any proper names in the time of Theseus, yet Plutarch<sup>f</sup> gives us to understand that the month, which was called Hecatombæon in the calendar of Solon, was called Cronius in the time of Theseus. It tends to confirm this testimony, that from the time of Solon downwards the Attic Κρόνια certainly fell out in the month Ἐκατομβαιῶν—Κρόνια εἰς ἑορτὴν Ἐκατομβαιῶνος μηνὸς Κρόνω—Κρονίων ὄζων<sup>h</sup>. ἔστι δὲ Κρόνια παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἑορτή. ἤγετο δὲ Ἐκατομβαιῶνι μηνί—and as we learn from Demosthenes Contra Timocratem, and the Scholia upon it, on the 12th of that month. And though it does not necessarily follow from this fact, that the mensis Cronius of the time of Theseus must have agreed in all other respects with the Hecatombæon of Solon, yet it may reasonably be supposed that it must at least have occupied the same site in the natural year; and therefore if Hecatombæon stood next to the summer solstice, the mensis Cronius must have done so too. And how appo-

Cronos on this mountain, at the vernal equinox, in the month Elaphius at Elis: which can leave little doubt that Κρόνος, so worshipped, and at this particular season of the year, must have been considered the same with the sun.

It appears from Diodorus Siculus, that mountains, promontories, eminences, and rising grounds in general, in the opinion of antiquity, were sacred to Κρόνος. So at least it may be inferred from the following passage, (which asserts the fact in a particular instance,) viz. that in Sicily, Italy, and Libya, at a very remote period, natural heights and strongholds were still called after him, in memory of that relation<sup>2</sup>: Δυναστεῦσαι δὲ φασι τὸν Κρόνον κατὰ Σικελίαν καὶ Λιβύην ἔτι δὲ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἐν τοῖς πρὸς ἑσπέραν τόποις συστήσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν. παρὰ πᾶσι δὲ φρουραῖς διακατέχειν τὰς ἀκροπόλεις καὶ τοὺς ὄχυρους τῶν τόπων τούτων ἀφ' οὗ δὴ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν (χρόνου) κατὰ τε τὴν Σικελίαν καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἑσπέραν νεύοντα μέρη πολλοὺς τῶν ὑψηλῶν τόπων ἀπ' ἐκείνου Κρόνια προσαγορεύεσθαι. The fact may have been as it is here said to have been, though the reason assigned for it is imaginary. The truth is, Κρόνος was the type of the sun; and the highest points of the earth were naturally considered most sacred to him, as nearest to the locality of his visible presence, the upper air. For the same reason the tops of mountains were peculiarly sacred to Zeus; but as the type of the sun too, at first, as much as Cronos.

<sup>2</sup> iii. 61.

<sup>f</sup> Theseus, xii. cf. xxiv. xxxvi: also supra, vol. iv. 515.

<sup>ε</sup> Hesychius. Cf. Etym. M. Ἐκατομβαιῶν.

<sup>h</sup> Schol. in Nubes, 397.

site that would be to the site of a month which was attached to such a date as July 25, in the natural or Julian year, requires no proof.

If then this statement of Plutarch, (corroborated by circumstantial evidence.) that there was a month, as far back as the time of Theseus, the site of which in the natural year corresponded to that of Hecatombæon, may be received as authentic; then the name which he gives this month, along with the fact that the games instituted by Pelops were dedicated to Cronos, and called *Κρόνια* after him, does much to authorise the inference that it must have been so called, because it was the month of the *Κρόνια*. It will follow, on that supposition, that this *mensis Cronius* could have been nothing more nor less than the *ΕΠΑΓΟΜΕΝÆ* of the Julian year of Pelops, five in the common years, six in the leap-year; nothing more nor less than the six *feriæ* of the Olympic cycle.

It will follow also, that though the *Επαγομενæ* of the Julian calendar of Pelops, on this principle, must have had a proper name, the rest of the months could not have had any; and therefore that the existence of a *mensis Cronius* at the end of this Olympic calendar is no proof that in other respects it did not follow the analogy of the Primitive calendar in general, in having no proper names for its months. The *Επαγομενæ* of this calendar indeed, from the special reasons of the case, might be distinguished from those of every other, whether Equable or Julian, of the same time; but the rest of the months, for anything which is known to the contrary, could have exhibited no contrast to those of any other.

iv. The *Επαγομενæ* of the Primitive calendar not being included in any of the months, but standing by themselves, and being scarcely taken into account in the ordinary reckoning of the year itself, by their very position in the calendar, and by their peculiar relation to the rest of its constituent parts, would appear to have been designated for uses and purposes of their own. It might easily be conceived that these five days, isolated as they were from all the calendar besides, had nothing in common with the rest of the year. No five days in the calendar were so likely *a priori* to be regarded as independent of the ordinary business of society, as set apart by nature itself for something different

from the usual concerns of life. None were so likely to be fixed upon as holidays, both in public and in private, and to be devoted by common consent to amusement, recreation, and pastime. Nor can any conjecture be more probable than that, (except in particular cases, and for special reasons,) while the Primitive equable calendar was everywhere in use, they were very generally so applied.

We know indeed that among the Aztecs or Mexicans, of Spanish America, when the Spaniards first became acquainted with them, these five days laboured under a prejudice of long standing, and were regarded as ominous and unfortunate; but it is certain, on the other hand, that the estimation in which they were held by the inhabitants of the old world, (especially those of the east, from among whom Pelops came into Greece,) was not of this forbidding kind. Among the Egyptians these five days were the birthdays of their five principal gods<sup>b</sup>. Among the ancient Babylonians these five (or rather six) days constituted the Sakean feriæ, the most festive occasion in their year. Among the Phrygians, the nearest neighbours of the ancient Mæonians, not long before the migration of Pelops, the Epagomenæ of the Phrygian correction of Midas had been designated by that reformer and legislator as the stated feriæ of his Sacra Phrygia, the rites and services of his Cosmogonic Duad, Attes and Kybele.

The first idea therefore of devoting these days to a peculiar use and purpose, like that of his own Cronia, might not have originated with Pelops— might have been suggested to him even by the Phrygian correction of Midas; but the idea of setting them apart, and dedicating them, in the form of his Mensis Cronius, to the generous and masculine exercises of the ancient Gymnas of the Greeks,

*ἄλμα ποδοκείην δισκὸν ἄκοντα πάλην—*

to feats of strength and activity, to contests in the foot, or the horse and chariot, race, instead of those outrages on nature, and those violations of decency, which characterized the application and use of such days in the Phrygian and many other calendars of antiquity, this idea, we say, was probably

<sup>b</sup> See our *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 384: iii. 140 sqq.



first conceived by Pelops, and first realised in the institution of his Cronia, and in the appropriation to them of these six Epagomenæ of his Olympic calendar, under the name of the *Mensis Cronius* (the Μῆν Κρόνιος).

v. It is almost superfluous to argue that if the games of Pelops were actually instituted either B. C. 1264 or 1260, they could not possibly have been dedicated to the Olympian Zeus, nor have been called Olympic, by virtue of that relation to him; simply because the Olympian Zeus, even in Crete, was not yet in being, B. C. 1264. And though he came into being in Crete, in B. C. 1260—he could not yet have been heard or known of in the Peloponnese, by B. C. 1260. But they might have been dedicated to Κρόνος, who was forty years old in Crete itself, B. C. 1260, and by B. C. 1264 might have become very generally known as an object of worship, elsewhere among the Greeks; especially if, even though dedicated to the Κρόνος of Crete, and under the name of Κρόνια, derived from him, they must still have been dedicated to the sun. For that both the Cronos and the Rhea of the older Cretan Theogonia were Types of the sun and the moon, as much as the Zeus and the Hera of the Theogonia of Minos, has been shewn in the Third Dissertation. And without entering again upon the question of the origin of this idea of the sun, under the name of Κρόνος, or on that of the etymon and meaning of the name so applied to it, we may be content to acquiesce in the explanation, which was most naturally suggested by the form of the name itself—as simply the transmutation of the Greek word for Time, by the change of a single letter, into the Greek for the God of Time, or for the principle of time itself, treated as a person. The application of the word *time* to the sun, even as the author and cause of time, unchanged and unmodified, would have offended the sense of propriety; but to apply the name of time, with so much of change in its external form, as would shew it to be intended of something different from time yet closely related to time, (i. e. the sun as the first principle and cause of time,) would be agreeable to analogy and to the reason of things.

That the Κρόνος of Pelops at least must have been meant of the sun, cannot be doubtful. The date of his *mensis Cro-*

nus, June 25, the summer solstice in the sphere of Mazzaroth, is decisive on that point. And that Κρόνος and Ἥλιος must once have been considered the same at Elis (i. e. Olympia, where the games were celebrated) may be inferred from the following traditionary explanation of the name of Ἥλιος itself, which appears in the *Etym. Magnum*<sup>i</sup>: Πρὸ τοῦ (τὸν) Δία κτήσασθαι τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν παρὰ τῆς Γῆς, αὐτὴν παρειλήφεσαν Ἥλιός τε καὶ Κρόνος. γνώρισμα δὲ τοῦ κτήματος κοινός ἐστι βωμός ἀμφοῖν αὐτῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ· σύμβολον δὲ καὶ τὸδε· τοῦ μὲν ὁ Κρόνιος λόφος καλούμενος, τοῦ δὲ ἡ Ἥλιος μέγχι τοῦ νῦν καλουμένη. ἐπώνυμος τοῦ θεοῦ. The derivation of the name of Ἥλιος from that of Ἥλιος the sun in Greek, may or may not be true\*; and the reader must judge for himself on that point: but the fact which is here asserted of the existence of an altar at Olympia, common to Κρόνος and Ἥλιος, may well be supposed historical. And if so, it can leave no doubt that Κρόνος and Ἥλιος, the joint owners of this altar at Olympia, must have been the same, and have had an equal relation to the Olympic solemnity. The same conclusion follows from the fact which we learnt from Pausanias<sup>k</sup>, of a stated sacrifice at Elis to Κρόνος at the vernal equinox, in the month Elaphius. The god so worshipped at the vernal equinox could have been none but the sun.

\* There can be no doubt that, on etymological principles, Ἥλιος would denote in Greek the land of Ἥλιος—and as little that Ἥλιος in Greek would be regularly derived from Ηλ, the Hebrew for God, simply by the addition of *os*. We have seen from the Dissertation on the Rhodian Ἀλεῖα, that the oldest form of the name of the sun in Greek was Ἥλιος, not Ἥλιος; and that would be explained at once, by the very probable supposition, that the sun having been the first of the objects in external nature, every where recognised and proposed as divine, and as the supreme principle itself—the name of Ηλ meaning god, and the god κατ' ἐξοχήν, was transferred to the sun. On this principle, the name of the sun in Greek would first be ἡλος, and then ἡλιος. And from the first form of the name, the name of Elis itself might have been derived—denoting, *virtute termini*, the “Land of the sun.”

<sup>i</sup> Ἥλιος.

<sup>k</sup> Supra. 541 n.

SECTION VII.—*Scheme of the Cronian, or Olympian, Calendar of Pelops, for each of the years of its proper cycle of leap-year.*

We shall therefore conclude this part of our subject with the type of the Cronian calendar of Pelops, for each of the years of its proper cycle of leap-year; premising that, because of the inequality of this cycle to the Julian, properly so called, (the Cronian bearing date in the second year of the Julian,) the *mensis Cronius* of Pelops must necessarily have had a double Julian date, June 25 and June 26; June 25 in the second and first years of the proper Julian cycle, June 26 in the third and fourth, as the scheme itself will shew.

*Cronian or Olympian Calendar of Pelops, for one cycle of the Cronia or Olympia, and one cycle of the Julian leap-year.*

Cronian Cycle.	Mensis Cronius.	Cronian Cycle.	Julian Cycle.	
Year.		Year, 1st Month.	Year.	B. C.
iv Exeunt.	June 25—30	i July 1*	ii	1264
i —	June 26—30	ii July 1	iii	1263
ii —	June 26—30	iii July 1	iv	1262
iii —	June 25—29	iv June 30	i	*1261
iv —	June 25—30	i July 1	ii	1260

SECTION VIII.—*On the Olympia ascribed to Hercules, and on the nature and date of the change made by him in the Cronian Institution of Pelops.*

We shall now proceed to consider the tradition which attributed the foundation of the Olympic games to Hercules, and in what sense it may have been true, without prejudice to the conclusion just established, that the original founder of the games, supposed to be meant by the Olympia, was Pelops.

\* Every month in this calendar, it is assumed, was of the same length, 30 days, after the analogy of the primitive equable one; and at the end of all, there were five days over in the first, second, and third years of the cycle, six in the fourth, (the Cronian *feriæ*, afterwards the Olympian,) the proper name of which was the *Μῆν Κρόνιος*, or *Mensis Cronius*.

First of all, it appears to have been commonly believed by the Greeks in later times, that the funeral games of Pelops were celebrated by Hercules<sup>1</sup>, and that these in fact were the very Olympic games, the first institution of which was ascribed to him. So that, on this principle, the Olympia were funereal in their origin, and of the nature of Parentalia, as much as the Isthmia or the Nemea—

Illic et Siculi superassem dona sēpulchri<sup>m</sup>,  
Et Nemees lucum, et Pelopis sollemnia trunci<sup>n</sup>.

Let us therefore begin with briefly considering this question, Whether the funeral obsequies of Pelops were, or were not, celebrated by Hercules, preliminary to the more important one, In what manner games, which had already been founded by Pelops, could have been instituted by Hercules? for, as these two things, the celebration of the funeral solemnities of Pelops, and the institution of the Olympia, by one and the same individual, were not necessarily connected in themselves, and are not always connected even by the tradition of antiquity, it is possible there may be good grounds for doubting of the former, without any prejudice to the truth of the latter.

i. Then, this particular fact that the funeral of Pelops was celebrated under the auspices of Hercules is contrary to antecedent probability, at least if Atreus, the son of Pelops, who succeeded to his power and dignity, was grown up at the time. It is not credible that the last honours would be paid to the deceased king by any one but his son and successor.

ii. This fact in the history of Hercules, and in that of Pelops, and in that of the games, appears to have been entirely unknown to Pindar, who ascribes the foundation of the games to Hercules, and recognises the honours paid to Pelops at Olympia, even by the appointment of Hercules, but nowhere connects the Olympic institution with the death of Pelops, much less the first Olympic games with the funeral games of Pelops.

iii. The origin of this tradition itself, though destitute of any foundation in the matter of fact, may nevertheless easily

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius Hal. Ant. Rom. v. 17.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Virgil, *Æneid.* v. 64 sqq.

<sup>n</sup> Statius, *Sylvæ*, v. iii. 51. Epice-

dium in Patrem. cf. Clemens. Alex. *Protrepticon*, ii. § 34. pag. 29. 14.

be explained by an historical tradition on another point, which seems to have been correctly handed down; viz. That the honours rendered *de facto* to Pelops at the Olympic games were first rendered by Hercules, and as rendered ever after were the appointment of Hercules<sup>o</sup>: and, as these were of the nature of Parentalia, or (as Pindar calls them) *αἵμακουρία*, they might easily have been confounded by posterity with his funeral obsequies.

iv. The date of the death of Pelops being assumed to have been B. C. 1244, it would not be compatible with the chronology of the Life of Hercules to suppose him to have presided at so important a solemnity as the funeral of Pelops. The personal history indeed of Hercules is full of difficulties; in explanation of which, though it is not necessary for the sake of our proper argument that we should enter upon them at any length, we may observe, that with respect to the date of his birth, to judge from Pausanias' account of his parentage<sup>n</sup>, which makes him the fourth in descent from Pelops, there might have been as much as 90 years between the birth of Pelops and that of Hercules; so that if Pelops was born about B. C. 1313, Hercules could not even have been alive B. C. 1244. In this account however Pausanias is undoubtedly mistaken; and it may be more truly collected from that of Diodorus<sup>q</sup>, that Hercules was the *third* in descent from Pelops, not the *fourth*, and (what is still more important on this question of the date of his birth) by the mother's side not the father's; i. e. that Alemene, the mother of Hercules, was the daughter of Eurydike, or (as she is also called) Laodike, the daughter of Pelops: so that Hercules was the grandson of Eurydike, and the great-grandson of Pelops, but by the mother's side. Electryon, the son of Perseus, and grandson of Acrisius, married Eurydike, the daughter of Pelops, by whom he had Alemene; and Alemene married Amphitryon, by whom she had Hercules.

Now we are at liberty to assume that Pelops did not come into Greece later than B. C. 1285, the 28th or 29th year of his age; that Eurydike might have been his oldest child, and born B. C. 1284: and we are at liberty to assume also, if

<sup>o</sup> Cf. the Schol. ad Olymp. i. 149: Apollodorus, Bibl. ii. vii. 2: Pausanias, v. xiii. 1. <sup>p</sup> v. xiii. 1. <sup>q</sup> iv. 9. cf. supra, vol. iv. 507.

necessary, that between the birth of Eurydike and the birth of Alcmene there might not have been more than an interval of 12 years; nor between the birth of Alcmene and the birth of Hercules more than another of 12 also: so that if Eurydike was born B. C. 1284, Alcmene might have been born B. C. 1272, and Hercules B. C. 1260, because the marriageable age of females in Greece was as early as 10 or 11, and instances are on record of such marriages in Greece, when one of the parties was not more than of that age<sup>r</sup>. We have seen<sup>s</sup> that in the case of Helen, in order to the explanation of the chronology of her history according to Homer, it is absolutely necessary to suppose she was married at ten or eleven, and had a child at eleven or twelve.

There is consequently no insuperable objection *a priori* either from the laws of nature, or from the customs of society among the Greeks, even at this early period, to the supposition that between the birth of Eurydike, the daughter of Pelops, and that of Hercules, the son of Alcmene, there might not have been more than 24 years complete; and that if Eurydike was born B. C. 1284, Hercules might have been B. C. 1260. Nor would it be difficult to shew that *this* date of his birth is as consistent with the facts of his subsequent history, as any which could be substituted for it. According to the common tradition<sup>t</sup>, he died at 52; according to some, at 60<sup>v</sup>. The former would date his death B. C. 1208, the latter B. C. 1200; the former, as we have seen<sup>x</sup>, confirmed by the chronology of the Life of Theseus, the latter too near to the commencement of the Trojan expedition to be true. If however B. C. 1260 was the actual date of his birth, he could have been only 16 years of age B. C. 1244; and it is incredible that one of that age, (a mere *ἔφηβος* as yet, according to the reckoning of ages among the Greeks,) could have taken the lead at the funeral solemnities of a king and chief like Pelops, over the head of his son and successor, Atreus.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony, &c. i. 399. 494: iii 415.

<sup>s</sup> *Supra*, vol. iv. 511.

<sup>t</sup> Clemens Alex. *Protrepticon*, ii. 30. pag. 26. l. 19: Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.* Lat. i. 133. ad Ann. 826: *Thesaurus*

*Temporum*, ad Ann. 825: Syncellus, pag. 12-19.

<sup>v</sup> Cf. the *Variæ* of Ptolemy son of Hephæstion, apud Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 190. pag. 146 sqq.

<sup>x</sup> *Supra*, vol. iv. page 507 sqq.

But notwithstanding this, it will not follow that the death of Pelops itself might not have fallen out at the Olympic season; and his funeral games, agreeably to the custom of the time, which required something of that kind to be celebrated in honour of him, might not have been the Olympic games themselves. And this leads us to observe, in the last place, that testimony is extant which both attributes the celebration of his funeral obsequies to Atreus, not to Hercules, and supposes them also to have coincided with the Olympic season, and to have been celebrated in the form of the Olympic games.—*Hoc sacrum (the Olympia) eodem loco instituisse fertur abhinc annos MCL. Atreus, cum Pelopi patri funebres ludos faceret*<sup>1</sup>—Hercules himself being recognised as a candidate on the same occasion, and as having carried off the prize in every description of contest: *Quo quidem in ludicro omnis generis certaminum Hercules victor exstitit.*

The epoch, to which Velleius Patereulus refers all such dates as this, being the consular year of M. Vinicius, U. C. 783, A. D. 30<sup>7</sup>, 1250 years before that would give the date of these games B. C. 1221 or 1220; the latter of which would be an Olympic year, referred to the epoch of B. C. 1264—though too late for the date of the Olympic institution itself. But we refer to this testimony here, not to confirm our epoch of the institution, but simply to illustrate the tradition that the funeral solemnities of Pelops were celebrated at the Olympic season, and in and through the Olympic games, yet not by Hercules, the grandson of Pelops, but by Atreus, his son and successor, at a time in the life of Hercules when he was old enough to take part in the contests on the occasion, and to win the prize in them all: as one of the age of an *ἔφῆβος* (16 or 17) might have been.

This preliminary question then, which mixes up the celebration of the funeral obsequies of Pelops with the institution of the Olympia, having been thus disposed of, we may proceed to consider the question of the latter as attributed to Hercules, on its own merits. And here the first inquiry which naturally suggests itself is that of the antiquity and the cre-

<sup>1</sup> Vell. Patere. i. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. our *Origines Kal. Italicæ*, i. 43, note.

dibility of this tradition? with respect to which it may be observed, that as the oldest testimony to this effect, extant at present, is that of Pindar, so were Pindar's the only testimony to the same effect still in existence, it might nevertheless justly be contended that even his single testimony was competent to vouch for the common belief that the games, which are celebrated in his Olympic odes, and are called Olympic, and sacred to the Olympic Zeus, were founded by none but Hercules, not even by the Lydian Pelops, to whose connection with these very games, and to the distinguished place assigned to his memory in the ritual of the solemnity, the same odes bear so clear a testimony notwithstanding.

This foundation of the Olympic games, as all Pindar's readers must be aware, is attributed to Hercules on every occasion which leads to the mention of the fact at all<sup>a</sup>; and the moving cause to it is uniformly assigned to the same incident in his personal history, his victory over Augeas king of Elis. The first allusion to this topic is Ol. ii. 5-8.

Ὀλυμπιάδα δ' ἔστα-  
σεν Ἡρακλῆς  
ἀκρόθινα πολέμου.

And the whole story, as traditionally handed down, of this exploit and its consequences, is expanded and related at large in the xth (=xith) Olympic ode, which is almost entirely taken up with it—

Ver. 28. Ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξάιρετον ἀείσαι  
θέμιτες ὄρσαν Διὸς, ὃν ἀρχαί-  
φ' σάματι πᾶρ Πέλοπος  
βίη Ἡρακλέος  
ἐκτίσσατο, ἐπεὶ Ποσειδάμιον  
πέφνε Κτέατον ἀμύμονα,  
πέφνε δ' Εὐρυτον, ὡς Λυγέαν λάτριον  
ἀέκονθ' ἐκὼν μισθὸν ὑπέρβιον  
πράσσοιτο—

Ver. 51. Ὅ δ' ἄρ' ἐν Πίσᾳ ἔλσας ὅλον τε στρατὸν  
λεϊάν τε πᾶσαν Διὸς ἄλκιμος  
υἱὸς σταθμᾶτο ζάθεον ἄλσος  
πατρὶ μεγίστῳ· περὶ δὲ πάξαις

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Ol. ii. 5-7 : iii. 19-24 ; 24-57 : vi. 113-119 : x=xi. passim : cf. Nemea, x. 60, 61 : xi. 30-37.



Ἄλτιν μὲν ὄγ' ἐν καθαρῷ  
 διέκρινε, τὸ δὲ  
 κύκλω πέδον ἔθηκε δόρπου λύσιν,  
 τιμάσας πόρον Ἄλφειοῦ  
 μετὰ δώδεκ' ἀνάκτων θεῶν. καὶ πάγον  
 Κρόνου προσεφθέγγετο κ', τ. λ.  
 .. .. ταῦτα  
 δ' ἐν πρωτογόνῳ τελετᾷ  
 παρέσταν μὲν ἄρα  
 Μοῖραι σχεδὸν, ὃ τ' ἐξελέγχων μόνος  
 ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον  
 χρόνος.

And in referring it to this period in the labours of Hercules, he is followed by many of the ancients, influenced no doubt by his authority<sup>b</sup> \*.

\* The Scholiast on Pindar observes that, according to some authorities, Hercules was rather the reviver than the founder of the Olympic solemnity<sup>1</sup>—Ἦν γὰρ κατὰ τινὰς παραμεληθείς. But the interval between Pelops and Hercules was too short to allow of that supposition: nor is it credible that games founded by Pelops himself, and in honour of the sun, and intended for perpetuity, could have fallen into desuetude in *his* lifetime. It is manifest that *this* was a conjecture of the commentators on Pindar, made because it seemed to be necessary, in order to reconcile *his* account of the origin of the games with the tradition which attributed them to Pelops. It is evident that, in the opinion of Pindar himself, no one could dispute with Hercules the honour of having been the author of the games which are celebrated in his Olympic odes; and that they came into existence on the occasion of which he gives an account in his x=xi ode; and that the first was that which is there described, and called for that reason the *πρωτόγονος τελετή*, the first-born solemnity of its kind. It appears from Strabo<sup>2</sup> that Ephorus too was one of those who attributed the Olympic institution to Hercules; though he himself speaks doubtfully concerning it<sup>3</sup>: and we may infer from the Scholia on Plato<sup>4</sup>, especially as compared with Photius<sup>5</sup>, that Duris of Samos also concurred in this opinion. To these we may add Lysias, in his Olympicus<sup>6</sup>, the date of which Mr. Clinton, on the authority of Diodorus<sup>7</sup>, fixes to Olymp. xcviii, B. C. 388—in which year the games were celebrated July 20–25: Ἄλλων τε πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων ἕνεκα, ὧ ἄνδρες, ἄξιον Ἡρακλέους μεμνήσθαι, καὶ ὅτι τόνδε τὸν ἀγῶνα πρῶτος συνήγειρε δι' εἴνοιαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Polybius.

<sup>b</sup> Cf Schol. in Iliad. A. 700: Eustathius, in II. A. 698. 879. 50: Apollodorus, Bibl. ii. vii. 2: Diodorus Sic. iv.

13, 14: 53: Thomas Magister, Vita Pindari: Chron. Par. Epocha xix.

<sup>1</sup> Ad Olymp. ii. 4. cf. ad iii. Eis Θεοξένια. and ad ver. 62.

<sup>4</sup> ii. 380. Phædo, 69. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Lexicon, Οὐδὲ Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δῦο.

<sup>2</sup> viii. iii. 178. <sup>3</sup> viii. iii. 173.

<sup>6</sup> xxxiii. § 1.

<sup>7</sup> xiv. 109.

But it is by all means to be observed, that the games which he attributes to Hercules are those which he celebrates in his Olympic odes: and of these *two* things are certain, *one* that they were dedicated to Zeus, the *other* that they were never

quoting some anonymous author<sup>8</sup>, refers not only the Olympic institution, but the Olympic Ἐκεχειρία, to Hercules. The claim of Phlegon, at least, Olymp. viii, B. C. 748, to preside at the games, must be decisive that the institution was commonly referred in his time to Hercules.

A tradition is extant also, with respect to the Olympic stadium, which, if founded on fact, would likewise be decisive on this point. Nam quum fere constaret, says A. Gellius<sup>9</sup>, curriculum stadii quod est Pisæ, ad Jovis Olympii, Herculem pedibus suis metatum, idque fecisse longum pedes sexcentos; cetera quoque stadia in terra Græcia ab aliis postea instituta pedum quidem esse numero sexcentum sed tamen aliquantulum breviora. Censorinus tells us<sup>10</sup> the proportion of the Olympic stade to the Italic was that of 600 : 625—i. e. if the Italic stade was equal to the Olympic, the Olympic foot was  $\frac{1}{50}$  longer than the Italic. A. Gellius<sup>9</sup> proceeds to relate how Pythagoras, assuming the 600th part of the Olympic stade to have been the measure of the foot of Hercules, from the proportion of the human foot to the human body, calculated his stature; and so gave occasion to the proverb, Ex pede Herculem.

And though this is probably the true account of the length of the Olympic stade, it is sometimes represented as still greater. Thus Philargyrius, ad Georg. iii. 202, in Maxima: Maximi ex omnibus, quod sint pedum septingentorum; cum alii minus. In the Scholia rec. on Pindar<sup>11</sup> it is represented at 300 cubits (450 feet), with a various reading of 300 feet. It is often stated at six πλέθρα, or called an Ἐκπλεθρον—which too is the same thing as 600 feet.

Ἦδη δ' ἂν ἔλκων κῶλον ἐκπλέθρου δρόμου  
ταχύς βαδιστῆς τερμόνων ἀνθήπτετο<sup>12</sup>—

Ἦκει γὰρ οὐκ ἀχρεῖον ἔκπλεθρον δραμών<sup>13</sup>—

The plethrum was the sixth part of a stade—Πέλεθρον· μέτρον γῆς, ὃ φασι μυρίους πόδας ἔχειν, τινές δὲ σταδίου ἕκτον<sup>14</sup>—Πέλεθρα<sup>15</sup>· πλέθρα . . . σταδίου ἕκτον—Πλέθρον· τὸ τοῦ σταδίου ἕκτον μέρος<sup>16</sup>· . . ὅλον γὰρ τὸ στάδιον ἐστὶ τετρακοσίων πήχων (600 feet)—Πλέθρον δὲ ἐστὶ μέρος ἕκτον σταδίου. τοῦτο δὲ πήχεις ἔχει τετρακοσίων· ὡν τὸ ἕκτον πήχεις ἐξήκοντα ἐξ δίμοιρον, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ πλέθρον<sup>17</sup>.

The exact length then of the Olympic stade was no doubt 400 cubits,

<sup>8</sup> xii. 26, 2.

<sup>9</sup> i. 1.

<sup>10</sup> De Die, xiii.

<sup>11</sup> Ad Olymp. xiii. 39.

<sup>12</sup> Euripides, Medea, 1181.

<sup>13</sup> Electra, 883.

<sup>14</sup> Hesychius. <sup>15</sup> Suidas.

<sup>16</sup> Photii Lexicon: cf. Suidas in πλέθρα and πλέθρον.

<sup>17</sup> Scholia in Platon. ii. 389: Alkibiades, i. 344. 3: cf. 445: Critias, 162. 18: Anecdota, 295, 11. πλέθρα: Herod. ii. 149.

known by any name but that of the Olympia. Now *two* things also have been established concerning the games of Pelops—one that they were dedicated to Cronos, the *other* that they were known only by the name of Cronia. In these distinctions we possess all the clue to the discovery of the truth on this question which can be necessary. The Cronia, dedicated to Cronos, were founded by Pelops; the Olympia, dedicated to Zeus, were founded by Hercules: and yet the Cronia and the Olympia were the same institution; celebrated in the same locality, regulated by the same rule; recurring in the same cycle; differing only in name, and in the object of worship to which they were consecrated, and in the order of time in which they came into being, respectively. There was consequently no real inconsistency between the two traditions, one of which attributed the same institution to Pelops, and the other to Hercules. There was no contradiction between the two propositions, That Pelops was the founder of the games (in the sense of the Cronia), and That Hercules was so too (in the sense of the Olympia). There was none even between the proposition, That Pelops was the founder of the Olympia, and That Hercules was the founder of the Olympia

600 feet; but what proportion its aliquot parts bore to those of any other is another question. Eusebius<sup>18</sup> mentions an athlete whose foot 600 times repeated measured this stade; and who consequently, by Pythagoras' rule, must have been as tall as Hercules. Another name for the stade or race-course was that of *Αἰλός*; whence that of the double stade *Δίαυλος*. *Αἰλός*<sup>19</sup> *στάδιον*· *καὶ τὸ διστάδιον διάυλος*—*Στάδιον*<sup>20</sup>· *κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκαλείτο αἰλός· ὅθεν διάυλος, τὰ δύο στάδια, ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο αἰλῶνας ἔχειν*. And the *αἰλός* or stade being 400 cubits, the *διάυλος* was 800 cubits. *Δίαυλος*<sup>21</sup>· *μέτρον πηχῶν* (supple) *ὦ'* (though Suidas<sup>22</sup> has *σ'* (200)<sup>23</sup>—

*Θᾶσσον δὲ βύρσαν ἐξέδειρεν ἢ δρομεὺς  
δισσοὺς διαύλους ἵππιος διήνυσε*<sup>24</sup>.

The *δρόμος ἵππιος* was the tetrastade—*Ἰππειος δρόμος*<sup>25</sup>· *τετραστάδιός τις*—*Ἰππικόν*· *τὸ στάδιον*<sup>26</sup>—*τὸ δὲ ἵππικόν, διάστημα τεσσάρων ἤν σταδίων*<sup>27</sup>. The horses in the chariot-race made twelve heats or courses<sup>28</sup>.

18 Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 287. Ol. xxxiii. cf. the Anecdota Græca Parisiensia, ii. 143. 20. Lygdamus of Syracuse.

19 Etym. M. 20 Ibid.

21 Hesychius. 22 In voce.

23 Cf. Schol. ad Aves, 293. Ἐπὶ τὸν *δίαυλον ἤλθον*.

24 Euripides, Electra, 824.

25 Hesychius; cf. Photius in Ἰππεῖς.

26 Hesychius.

27 Plutarch, Solon, xxiii; cf. Pausanias, vi. xvi. 4.

28 Supra, p. 492.

also; if by the former you understand the solemnity, the cycle of which, and the rule of which, in all respects, was that of the Olympia. The real inconsistency would be to say that Hercules founded the Olympia, and dedicated them to Cronos, or that Pelops founded the Cronia, and dedicated them to Zeus.

This then being the simple and natural explanation of all the difficulty which appears to beset this question of the origin of these institutions, and their proper authors, respectively; let us proceed to consider the probable date of the Olympia of Hercules, as we have already done that of the Cronia of Pelops. For this purpose we observe that, according to the chronologers of antiquity<sup>c</sup>, the interval from the first Olympia of Hercules to the first historical Olympiad is differently represented at 600, 470, 459, and 430 years respectively; i. e. B. C. 1376, 1246, 1235, and 1206. The first and last of these, B. C. 1376 and B. C. 1206, may be set aside, as erring too much, one in excess, the other in defect, to be admissible; and each of the other two, B. C. 1246 and 1235, however near it may approach to the truth, will require a correction, (B. C. 1244 for the one, B. C. 1236 for the other,) to make it agree with the Olympic cycle, reckoned back from B. C. 776.

Now the former of these, so corrected, it is evident, is our assumed date of the death of Pelops; and consequently of the Olympiad, which was in course at the time of his funeral obsequies. And though it is the year which modern<sup>d</sup> chronologers of great note have been inclined to adopt, as that of the Olympia attributed to Hercules, we have said enough to disprove that hypothesis. Having therefore to choose between this date and that of B. C. 1236, let us assume the mean between the two, B. C. 1240; and let us consider what there may be to recommend and confirm this, as the actual date of the Olympia instituted by Hercules, of which we are in search.

i. If Hercules was born B. C. 1260, he must have been 20

<sup>c</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 282: Anecdota Græca Paris. Pars ii. 141. 25: Syncellus, 324. 1-16: 327. 20-328. 2: 368. 12-370. 18: The-

saurus Temporum, Jerome in Chronico, ad ann. 811.

<sup>d</sup> See Mr. Clinton, F. Hell. i. cap. iii. p. 82 v. § 1. p. 76.

years old complete, B. C. 1240; and at 20 or 21 years of age he might already have begun to take that leading part among his contemporaries, which he must some time have begun to take, and have maintained to the end of his life. At 20 or 21 he might have been the author even of such an institution as the Olympia.

ii. It is just as probable that the name and nature of the Hellenic Zeus—the Zeus of classical mythology—might have become generally known to the Greeks by B. C. 1240, as the Cronos of earlier date by B. C. 1260: and it is equally probable that in proportion as the fame and estimation of the former became more generally known, those of the latter would decrease: especially if it was also known that, whether under the name of Cronos, or under that of Zeus, the idea denoted by both was that of the sun—in which case, it might appear to be only a question of names, not of realities, whether the honours before rendered to Cronos, as the type and impersonation of the sun, should be transferred to Zeus, in the same capacity, or not.

iii. This year, B. C. 1240, as it may be seen from our Tables, corresponded to *Æra cyc.* 2767, when the first of the primitive Thoth, according to the Julian rule, was falling on June 25 at midnight, i. e. on the proper Julian epoch of the *Mensis Cronius* of Pelops; as it never had done from the time of the institution of the Cronia until then. Now that coincidence was competent to designate this year as a remarkable one in the Cronian æra, as virtually the epoch of that æra itself, as the fittest at least to be made the epoch of a fresh reckoning of the æra from a new beginning. This coincidence of the primitive Thoth with the first day of the *Mensis Cronius* of Pelops, might have been the very thing which induced Hercules to institute the Cronia afresh under the name of the Olympia, and to dedicate them to the sun under the name of Zeus: and it might have entered into the plan which he had in view when he made this change, that setting out from the epoch of the games, in either case alike the solstice of Mazzaroth, June 25, the equable Thoth should go on receding upon it, and yet revolving round it at intervals of four years, commensurable with the Olympic cycle itself, until it returned to a coincidence with it again, at the

end of the great Period, which the Egyptians called the Sothiacal, 1460 Julian, 1461 equable, years. For that such would in reality be the consequence of this change, as made at this time, B. C. 1240, *Æra cyc.* 2767, whether contemplated or not beforehand, if the Olympia continued to be celebrated, and the equable year to be in use, long enough, there can be no question.

We may therefore take our leave of this part of our subject also, with one or two observations more. i. If this solemn institution of the Olympia in honour of Zeus, by Hercules, may be considered a public and national act, done by him in the name of the whole Hellenic community, then *this* inference is justly deducible from it; viz. That though the idea and name of the Hellenic Zeus might have been originated by Minos, and in Crete, Hercules was the author of their reception and recognition among the Greeks in general. The Olympia, instituted by Hercules on this occasion, in the name of the Greeks of the Peloponnese at least, were the sign and seal of the recognition of the divinity of Zeus on their part; and as long as they continued to be observed among them, as a national solemnity, with this reference to the Zeus of Hercules, they served the same purpose still.

ii. It is far from improbable, or rather, it is morally certain, that on this fact in the personal history of Hercules, viz. his having been the author of the introduction of the name and worship of the Olympic Zeus, was founded the tradition and belief of later times, that he was the son of Zeus. It is absurd to suppose that any such idea of his parentage could have been originated in his own lifetime, and among his own contemporaries; but the analogy of so many other instances of particular persons, who, having happened to be the first to introduce a new object of worship, for which their authority and influence procured a general reception, passed in consequence in the course of time for the sons or daughters of those gods or goddesses, to the recognition of whose divinity they had thus been instrumental, is, or ought to be, decisive, that, if the common belief concerning the relation of Hercules, the son of Alcmena, to the Olympic Zeus is to be explained on any rational principle, it must be on this, That he was in reality the author

of the worship of the Olympic Zeus itself among the Greeks : and it might contribute to that belief too, that so long as the true year of *his* birth continued to be remembered, and the true year of the correction of Minos in Crete, and of the birth of the Zeus of Minos. to be remembered also, they would be known to have been the same.

iii. If the first public acknowledgment of the Olympic Zeus was thus the doing of Hercules ; it may be inferred from that fact that the distinctive ceremony of the last of the Olympic Feriæ, the Βωμῶν ἀγιστεία or γεραρεία, as it was called, (the *θυσία*—to a certain number of the gods, which concluded the solemnity.) was either instituted or modified by him. The testimony of antiquity indeed, as we saw supra <sup>c</sup>, attributed to him the foundation of the Δωδεκάθεοι, the sacrifice on the six altars, each appropriated to two gods<sup>f</sup> ; Ἔθηκε δὲ καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν ἀγῶνα, Πέλοπος τε βωμὸν ἰδρύσατο, καὶ θεῶν δώδεκα βωμοὺς ἐξῆς ἐδείματο <sup>g</sup>. But among these gods, and in the order in which they were enumerated by the scholiast on Pindar <sup>e</sup>, six at least could not yet have been known of in the time of Hercules, Athene (Tritogenes), Apollo and Artemis, Dionysos, Hermes, and the Charites. It is however observable that in every list of this kind the name of Zeus stood first, and that of Cronos last ; and this may very well authorize the conjecture, that in reality according to the original appointment of Pelops, the concluding ceremony of the games was simply in honour of Cronos, or at most of Cronos and Rhea, as the Types and Impersonations of the sun and the moon : and according to the appointment of Hercules also of two more, Zeus and Hera, who, without superseding the Cronos and Rhea of the Cronian institution, simply took precedence of them in the order of the γεραρεία, and in the same capacity as the Types and Impersonations of the sun and moon. In the time of Pelops then there was only one altar and one sacrifice, that of Cronos, or at the most of Cronos and Rhea : from the time of Hercules, there were two altars and two sacrifices, one to Zeus and Hera, the other to Cronos and Rhea. And this is confirmed

<sup>e</sup> Vide page 506 n.

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Schol. ad Olymp. xi = x. 58.

<sup>g</sup> Apollonius, Bibl. ii. vii. 2. cf. Schol. ad Olymp. v. 7. Ψαύμιδος τε δῶρα : also ad v. 10.

by the tradition alluded to supra<sup>h</sup>, from the Etymologicicon, in explanation of the name of Ἥλιος—that there was an altar at Olympia from the first, sacred to Κρόνος and the sun—which must have been the altar of Pelops—appropriated to the γεραρεία of Pelops. We learn too from the scholia on Apollonius Rhod.<sup>i</sup> that besides the hill Cronios at Olympia, there was an hill called Olympus also; both on the north or north-east. It is far from improbable that while the Cronian sacrifice of Pelops was offered on the hill Κρόνιος, the sacrifice to Zeus was appointed by Hercules to be offered on the hill Ὀλυμπος—and that this is the true explanation of the title of Olympian applied to Zeus, and of Olympic applied to these games in honour of the Olympian Zeus, and in short of the first idea and name of the classical Olympus itself—much more so, than to suppose it derived from Mount Olympus in Macedonia, or Thrace, or from any other so called: especially if, as Syncellus gave us reason to believe, the name of Olympus was applied by the Egyptians, or by the ancient Greeks, in the time of Hercules, to the ecliptic, which would connect it at once with the sun, and through the sun with Zeus.

SECTION IX.—*On the Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus, and its date.*

The testimony of antiquity is given as uniformly to the fact of the revival of the Olympic games in the time of Iphitus and Lycurgus, as to that of their institution in the time of Hercules. It follows from the truth of this fact that, between the time of Hercules and that of Iphitus and Lycurgus, they must have fallen more or less into desuetude, and must have lost much of their original celebrity. Nor, if we look merely at the length of the interval in question, (ten generations, or 300 years, according to the ancient chronologers<sup>k</sup>.) and the many changes (some of them directly affecting the ancient Pisa,) which had taken place meanwhile, could such a contingency be considered *a priori* improbable. Pisa, as the capital of CEnomaus and Pelops, might have been in their

<sup>h</sup> Page 546.

<sup>i</sup> i. 598, 599. cf. Pausan. v. xiv. 5: Eustath. ad Il. A. 18. 27. 40.

<sup>k</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 282:

Anecdota Græca, Paris. ii. 140. 21—141. 29: cf. Mr. Clinton, F. H. i. cap. vii. page 140 sqq.



time the principal city of the Peloponnese; and yet have dwindled into insignificance by the time of Iphitus and Lycurgus.

And on this subject of the continued existence of the Olympic games from the time of Hercules downwards, it is both an interesting and an obvious question, whether any allusion to them, direct or indirect, occurs in Homer? Strabo observes<sup>1</sup>, Κατὰ δὲ τὰ Τρωϊκὰ ἢ οὐκ ἦν ἀγῶν στεφανίτης (no public institution open to candidates indiscriminately) ἢ οὐκ ἐῖδοξος, (none of any note,) οὐθ' οὗτος (the Olympia) οὐτ' ἄλλος οὐδεὶς τῶν νῦν ἐνδοξῶν· οὔτε μέμνηται τούτων Ὅμηρος οὐδενός, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων τιῶν ἐπιταφίω. And in this construction of the testimony of Homer, in our opinion, he was in the right; and either no clear allusion to any public solemnity, like the periodic games of later times, occurs in the Iliad or the Odyssey, or none but that to the Athenæa of Erichthonius, which we considered elsewhere<sup>m</sup>. Homer indeed does allude to contests, in which prizes were wont to be proposed and won<sup>n</sup>; but it is not certain that he means by them regular exhibitions of such kinds, or only *pro re nata*. The only games at least which he has referred to with any specification of their circumstances, as Strabo observed, are such as the custom of the times made usual on occasion of the deaths and funeral solemnities of kings and chiefs; the most remarkable, noticed by him, being those of Amarynkeus, king of Elis<sup>o</sup>.

Strabo continues, Καί τοι δοκεῖ τισι τοῦ Ὀλυμπιακοῦ μεμνήσθαι, ὅταν φῆ, τὸν Ἀνυγέαν ἀποστερήσαι τέσσαρας ἀθλοφόρους ἵππους ἐλθόντας μετ' ἄεθλα· φασί τε τοὺς Πισάτας μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου, ἱεροὺς νομισθέντας τοῦ θεοῦ. The passage to which he here referred is the following<sup>p</sup>—

Καὶ γὰρ τῶ χρεῖος μέγ' ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἥλιδι δῆ,  
τέσσαρες ἀθλοφόροι ἵπποι αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεσφιν,  
ἐλθόντες μετ' ἄεθλα· περὶ τρίποδος γὰρ ἔμελλον  
θεύσεσθαι· τοὺς δ' αὖθι ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀνυγείας  
κάσχεθε· τὸν δ' ἐλατῆρ' ἀφίει ἀκαχήμενον ἵππων<sup>q</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> viii. 3. 173.

<sup>m</sup> Supra, Dissertation i. page 9.

<sup>n</sup> Iliad. I. 123. 127. 265 sqq: T.

<sup>244</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. Ψ. 630-642: Hesiod. Fragm.

xxx: Schol. in Pind. Olymp. x. 46.

<sup>p</sup> Iliad. A. 698.

<sup>q</sup> Cf. Eustathius, ad Iliad. A. 698. 879. 43 sqq.

It is manifest however that Homer might with the utmost propriety have put an allusion even to the Olympic games into the mouth of Nestor, if they were really founded by Pelops; or assumed their existence during the war of Troy, if they were really founded by Hercules. But as to these particular games, Iliad A. 698 sqq. it was altogether a mistake in the critics of antiquity to understand them of the Olympic; first, because they were going on in Elis, not at Pisa; secondly, because they were celebrated by Augeas, and therefore were older than the Olympic, instituted by Hercules only after his death.

We must therefore acquiesce in the justness of Strabo's observation in general; and yet the fact will still hold good, that in all these allusions, the contests, which Homer recognises, (those, for example, at the funeral solemnities of Amarynkeus, or of Patroclus,) are such as characterised the periodic games of antiquity (especially the Olympia) from the first: the *πύξ*, the *πάλη*, the *δρόμος*, the *δóρν*, and the chariot race. And it will also be true that an allusion does occur in the Odyssey, in reference to the funeral solemnities of Achilles, which, as we hope to shew hereafter (though we cannot stop to do so at present,) is to be understood of the Olympic games. In the meanwhile, his silence with respect to any such event as the restoration of these games, after an interval more or less of desuetude, and by Iphitus and Lycurgus, whose contemporary, according to the ancient chronologers, he himself was, is explained by one of those remarkable coincidences, which nothing can account for but the truth itself; viz. that though he was the contemporary of Iphitus and Lycurgus, and the restoration of the games did happen in his time, no allusion to them as restored could possibly have occurred in the Iliad or the Odyssey, simply because both those poems had been composed and made public long before. The proof of this point however must also be reserved for the present. Let us then resume the consideration of our proper subject, the date of the Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus.

The ancients, as we have observed, agree in attributing the restoration of the Olympic games to Iphitus, and in associating with him the celebrated Spartan legislator Lycurgus,

Ὁς ὑπὸ πάντων. says Athenæus<sup>r</sup>, συμφώνως ἱστορεῖται μετὰ τοῦ Ἰφίτου τοῦ Ἠλείου τῆν πρώτην ἀριθμηθεῖσαν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων θέσιν διαθεῖναι—which would seem, at first sight, to imply that the Olympiad so restored by both of them was the Olympiad of Coræbus, the first historical Olympiad properly so called. But we shall see by and by that the Olympiad of Coræbus itself was reckoned from that of Iphitus and Lycurgus, as strictly the first historical one; and that must have been what Athenæus meant.

With respect to the personal history of these two illustrious characters, we shall not enter upon it ourselves, but refer the reader, who is desirous to see it, to the learned and elaborate work of Mr. Clinton<sup>s</sup>. It cannot be denied that it is obscure, and beset with chronological difficulties. Of Iphitus in particular, Pausanias tells us<sup>t</sup> that, according to the inscription on the Olympic discus, he was the son of Hæmon; according to the common tradition of the Greeks, the son of Praxonidas; according to the ἀρχαῖα γράμματα, the ancient chronicles, of the Eleans, the son of Iphitus—as if there had been among them a double Iphitus, the older the father, or grandfather, of the younger, who was the contemporary of Lycurgus, and along with him the second founder of the Olympic games.

There is nothing however in such circumstantial discrepancies as these, to justify the modern scepticism as to the truth of the belief and tradition of antiquity, that Iphitus, of Elis, and Lycurgus, of Sparta, were contemporaries, and more or less ὁμήλικες; and in this particular transaction of the reconstruction of the Olympic solemnity were concerned alike. Assuming this fact therefore, as something which must be admitted on the faith of testimony, whatsoever difficulties of any other kind may happen to be connected with it, we observe, That when they conceived the idea of this instauration, with a foresight superior to the limited views of their contemporaries, and in a spirit which was eminently in unison with everything known of the personal disposition and character of each of them, they conceived also that of the Olympic Σπονδαί; so that while they were only the restorers of

<sup>r</sup> xiv. 37.

<sup>t</sup> v. iv. 4. cf. iii. 5.

<sup>s</sup> F. Hell. i. cap. vii. 140 sqq.

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Mr. Clinton, F. Hell. i. vii. 140-143.

the games, they were the founders of the Ἐκεχειρία\*; and in all the allusions of antiquity to the first origination of the Olympic peace or truce, it is ascribed to them, and in particular to Iphitus. Pausanias tells us<sup>x</sup> that he was represented

\* The ἐκεχειρία, thus introduced by Iphitus and Lycurgus<sup>1</sup>, continued to be observed down to the latest times<sup>2</sup>; and in imitation probably of the Olympic rule in this respect, if not at first, yet in the course of time, the same ἐκεχειρία came to characterize the other games of the Period also. The Olympic σπονδαὶ are alluded to by Thucydides, B. C. 428<sup>3</sup>, and B. C. 420<sup>4</sup>; the Pythian, B. C. 422<sup>5</sup>; and the Isthmian, B. C. 412<sup>6</sup>; and some σπονδαὶ of this kind, by Xenophon, B. C. 390<sup>7</sup>. From the time of Solon too, as we saw in the first Part of this work<sup>8</sup>, the same privilege distinguished the Eleusinian mysteries, both the greater and the lesser. It was the duty of the curators and administrators of these different celebrities to announce this Ἐκεχειρία a certain length of time before the actual celebration; and in time of war, this interval of suspension from any open acts of warfare naturally assumed the name of Σπονδαί, and the Olympic ἐκεχειρία was called the Olympic Σπονδαί, the Pythian the Pythian σπονδαί, and the like, and the mystical ἐκεχειρία the Μυστηριωτίδες Σπονδαί—Ἵνομάζονται δὲ καὶ μυστηριωτίδες σπονδαὶ καὶ μυστικαὶ ἡμέραι<sup>9</sup>—Μόνοι δ' αἱ μυστηριωτίδες σπονδαὶ τοῦτομα ἔσωσαν, καὶ μόνοις Ἐλευσινίοις ὑγίαινεν ἡ Ἑλλάς<sup>10</sup>.

The σπονδαὶ Ὀλυμπιακαὶ are alluded to by Æschines<sup>11</sup>, Olymp. cviii, B. C. 348. On this passage of Æschines the Scholiast<sup>12</sup> observes: Οἱ καταγγελεῖς τῶν ἀγῶνων καλοῦνται σπονδοφόροι, καὶ ὁ χρόνος ἐκείνος καθ' ὃν ἄγονται οἱ ἀγῶνες σπονδαί—Ἐν ταῖς ἐπισήμοις ἑορταῖς ἐσπέndonτο οἱ Ἕλληνες πρὸς οἶον δήποτε ἦκον πόλεμον εἰς τὸν χρόνον τῆς ἑορτῆς. Cf. Photius, Σπονδοφόροι· οἱ τὰς σπονδὰς φέροντες κ', τ. λ. Pindar applies the title to the Eleans, as charged with that duty in behalf of the Olympic games—

Ὅν τε καὶ κάρυκες ὠρᾶν  
ἀνέγων, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα  
Ζηρός, Ἀλεῖοι<sup>13</sup>—

They were also styled Ἱεράγγελοι· θεωροὶ ἀγγέλλοντες τὰς πανηγύρεις<sup>14</sup>, and Θεαγγελεῖς· οἱ τὰς πανηγύρεις ἐπαγγέλλοντες<sup>15</sup>—though this latter title, if compounded of θέα and ἄγγελος, would apply to the announcers of any kind of show or spectacle whatever.

1 Cf. Plutarch, Lycurgus, xxiii.

2 Cf. Polyb. xii. 26. 2.

3 iii. 8. cf. ii. 103 : iii. 1.

4 v. 40. 49, 50.

5 v. 1.

6 viii. 6, 7. 9, 10.

7 Hellenica, iv. vii. § 2 : v. i. 29.

8 Vol. i. 42 note.

9 Pollux, i. i. 31.

10 Aristides, xix. Eleusinius, 420. 2. cf. Æsch. ii. § 140, 141.

11 De Falsa Leg. ii. § 12.

12 386. ad p. 88 ult.

13 Isthmia, ii. 34.

14 Hesychius.

15 Ibid.

at Olympia in the act of being crowned by Ἐκεχειρία—and that on the Olympic Disc, (a monument of the same date as the restoration,) not that fact, but the terms and prescriptions of the Ἐκεχειρία, destined from that time forward to characterise the Olympic season, were recorded. Χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον Ἰφίτος, γένος μὲν ὦν ἀπὸ Ὀξύλου ἡλικίαν δὲ κατὰ Λυκούργον τὸν γράψαιτα Λακεδαιμονίοις τοὺς νόμους, τὸν ἀγῶνα διέθηκεν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, πανήγυριν τε Ὀλυμπιακὴν αὐτὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐκεχειρίαν κατεστήσατο, ἐκλιπόντα ἐπὶ χρόνον ὀπόσος δὴ οὗτος ἦν . . . τῷ δὲ Ἰφίτῳ, φθειρομένης τότε δὴ μάλιστα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ ἐμφυλίων στάσεων καὶ ὑπὸ νόσου λοιμώδους, ἐπήλθεν αἰτῆσαι τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς θεὸν λύσειν τῶν κακῶν· καὶ οἱ προσταχθῆναί φασιν ὑπὸ τῆς Πυθίας ὡς αὐτὸν τε Ἰφίτον δέοι καὶ τοὺς Ἡλείους τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν ἀγῶνα (ἀνα)σώσασθαι. ἔπεισε δὲ Ἡλείους Ἰφίτος καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ θύειν, τὸ πρὸ τούτου πολέμιόν σφισιν Ἡρακλέα εἶναι νομίζοντας?—Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἰφίτῳ συνακμάσαι καὶ συνδιαθεῖναι τὴν Ὀλυμπιακὴν ἐκεχειρίαν λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ὦν ἔστι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ φιλόσοφος, τεκμήριον προσφέρων τὸν Ὀλυμπιάσι δίσκον, ἐν ᾧ τοῦνομα τοῦ Λυκούργου διασώζεται καταγεγραμμένον<sup>a</sup>—the particulars of the Ἐκεχειρία being written or engraven upon it in a manner adapted to the shape of the disc<sup>b</sup>: Ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἰφίτου δίσκος ἦν Ἐκεχειρία, ἣν ἐπὶ τοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις ἐπαγγέλλουσιν οἱ Ἡλείοι. ταύτην οὐκ ἐς εὐθὺ ἔχει γεγραμμένην, ἀλλὰ ἐς κύκλου σχῆμα περιέεισιν ἐπὶ τῷ δίσκῳ τὰ γράμματα.

The legislation of Lycurgus is dated by Cicero (primarily after Polybius, ultimately after Eratosthenes) 108 years before B. C. 776, i. e. B. C. 884: *Nam centum et octo annis postquam Lycurgus leges scribere instituit prima posita est Olympias; quam quidam nominis errore ab eodem Lycurgo constitutam putant*<sup>c</sup>. This confusion between the first Olympiad, understood of B. C. 776, and the Olympiad of Iphitus and Lycurgus, which was truly the first even in reference to that, is of frequent occurrence<sup>d</sup>—though even this proves that the reckoning of Olympiads must have gone on regu-

<sup>γ</sup> v. iv. 4.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. v. vii. 4—viii. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, i.

<sup>b</sup> Pausanias, v. xx. 1.

<sup>c</sup> *De Republica*, ii. p. 58 (cf. Mr. Clinton, *F. Hell.* i. 141): cf. *Oratio*, xxiv. 26, 63. *Pro Flacco*, B. C. 59:

*Thucyd.* i. 10: *Diodorus Sic.* xv. 1. 50. 65: *Scholia in Platon.* ii. 419: *Respubl.* x. 474. 21: *Livy*, xxxviii. 33, 34. cf. 32. 3: xxxix. 37 (32. 33-38).

<sup>d</sup> Cf. *Vell. Pat.* i. 7: *Solinus*, i. § 27, 28: *Prosper, Chron.* 692 B.

larly from the time of Iphitus and Lycurgus itself down to B. C. 776.

The question is then, For how long previously did that continue to be the case? In answer to which it may suffice to produce the following passage of the Greek Chronicon of Eusebius, recovered in the *Anecdota Græca Parisiensia* of the late Dr. Cramer<sup>e</sup>; which, with some variations, occurs in Syncellus also<sup>f</sup>:

Περὶ τῆς θέσεως τοῦ ἀγώνος τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ...

.. Τοῖς δὲ Ἡλείοις τάδε προαγορεῦσαι

.. .. .  
 Τὴν αὐτῶν ῥύεσθε πάτραν, πολέμου δ' ἀπέχεσθε,  
 κοινοδίκου φιλίας ἠγούμενοι Ἑλλήνεσσι  
 ἐνὶ ξυδοῖς ἔλθη φιλόφρων ἐνιαυτός\*.

τούτου χάριν Ἰφίτιος ἀπήγγειλε τὴν ἐκεχειρίαν, καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐπετέλεσε, σὺν Λυκούργῳ τῷ Λακεδαιμονίῳ συγγενεῖ τυγχάνοντι.... καὶ τότε μόνον ἦν σταδίου ὁ ἀγών †. ὕστερον δὲ τὰ ἄλλα ἄθλα κατὰ μέρος προστετέθη. ἱστοροῦσι δὲ οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοδῆμον τὸν

\* This line is read in Syncellus,

ἔστ' ἂν ἐνὶ ξυδοῖς ἔλθη φιλόφρων ἐνιαυτός.

In Phlegon, *De Olympiadibus*, 144, it is read,

ἔστ' ἂν πενταέτης ἔλθη φιλόφρων ἐνιαυτός.

But the reading in Syncellus, confirmed even by the corrupt one of the *Anecdota*, must have been the true.

† It is sometimes intimated that not only these games of Iphitus, but the first Olympic games, were confined to one contest, that of the foot-race: Πρῶτον γὰρ εὐρέθη τοῦ δρόμου τὸ ἄσκημα, καὶ ἡ πρώτη θέσις τῶν Ὀλυμπίων δρόμου ἦν τὸ σχῆμα<sup>1</sup>. Pindar however could not have been of this opinion<sup>2</sup>, nor the Scholiast on that ode<sup>3</sup>: by both of whom the *πένταθλον* is recognised as contemporary in point of institution with the games themselves<sup>4</sup>. And though elsewhere he speaks of this as late, yet he recognises the five contests (of which it consisted) each by itself as of the same antiquity with the institution.

Οὐ γὰρ ἦν πένταθλον ἔτ', ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ

ἔργματι κείτο τέλος<sup>5</sup>.

If the Cronia or Olympia consisted originally of one contest only—that of the foot-race—they must have been limited to one day from the first:

<sup>e</sup> ii. 140. 21—141. 29. cf. the *Chron. Arm. Lat.* ii. 278—282.

<sup>f</sup> 368. 13—370. 18.

<sup>1</sup> Schol. ad *Olymp.* i. 154. cf. *Pausanias*, v. viii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Olymp.* xi=x. 28 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ad vers.* 76—83.

<sup>4</sup> *Olymp.* xi. 66—80.

<sup>5</sup> *Isthm.* i. 35. cf. *Scholia in Platon.* ii. 384. *Amatores*, 290. 6.

Ἡλείον ὡς ἀπὸ εἰκοστῆς καὶ ἐβδόμης Ὀλυμπιάδος ἤρξαντο οἱ ἀθληταὶ ἀναγράφεσθαι .... πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀνεγράφη. ... τῇ δὲ εἰκοστῇ ὀγδόῃ τὸ στάδιον νικῶν Κόρυμβος Ἡλείος ἀνεγράφη πρῶτος· καὶ ἡ Ὀλυμπιάς αὕτη πρώτη ἐτάχθη ἀφ' ἧς Ἕλληνες ἀριθμοῦσι τοὺς χρόνους. τὰ δ' αὐτὰ τῷ Ἀριστοδήμῳ καὶ Πολύβιῳ ἱστορεῖ. Καλλίμαχος δὲ δεκατρεῖς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀπὸ Ἰφίτου παρήσθαι φησι μὴ ἀναγραφείσας· τῆς δὲ τεσσαρεσκαδεκάτης Κόρυβον νικῆσαι. πολλοὶ δὲ λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Ἀλκμήνης τοῦ ἀγῶνος θέσεως, ἐπὶ τὴν πρώτην ἀριθμουμένην Ὀλυμπιάδα, γενέσθαι ἔτη νηθ' (159). ἄγουσι δὲ Ἡλεῖοι πενταετηρικὸν τὸν ἀγῶνα, τεσσαρῶν ἔτων μεταξὺ συντελουμένων.

The Scholia on Plato<sup>s</sup> have the same statement concerning the number of Olympiads omitted, viz. 28, but they have confounded the interval between Iphitus and Coræbus with that between Pelops or Hercules and Iphitus. Strabo makes the number 25<sup>b</sup>. The date then of the first historical Olympiad being assumed B.C. 776; the omission of 13 Olympiads between that and the Olympiad of Iphitus gives the latter B. C. 828; the omission of 25, B. C. 876; the omission of 27, B. C. 884. And these being all the dates of this Olympiad, according to the chronologers of antiquity, among which we have to decide, that decision may be assisted by the following consideration.

The Cronian cycle of Pelops and the Olympian one of Hercules having been the same in themselves, and each of them a Julian cycle, the Cronian and the Olympian æra, to all intents and purposes, was a Julian æra of its kind. And as it was derived at first from the equable solar year, and ever after referrible to the decursus of that year, one of its most important elements was the period of 120 years, in which the recession of the equable on the Julian year, as a

but the institution of the *Mensis Cronius*, and its relation to the Cronian or Olympic feriae, is decisive that they must have been originally intended to last six days. The idea that the games were ever restricted to the foot-race is easily accounted for by the fact that the foot-race was always the first of the contests<sup>c</sup>, and that the Olympiads were registered in the name of the conquerors in the foot-race or stade only.

<sup>a</sup> ii. 405 : Resp. 246. 7. cf. Phlegon, De Olympiadibus, apud Meursium, 136.

<sup>b</sup> vii. 3. 173.

<sup>c</sup> Cf. Plato, De Legibus viii. Opp. iii. iii. 84, 11.

general rule, amounted to one equable month. The Cronian æra bore date on the first epagomene, Æra Cyc. 2742 *ex.*, the Olympian, on the first of Thoth, Æra Cyc. 2767—but both on the summer-solstitial date of the sphere of Mazzaroth, June 25: and we have already adverted to the probability that, when Hercules attached the epoch of his æra to this Julian term, he expected the first of his Thoth to revolve perpetually round this Julian term, in the great Cyclico-Julian period of 1460 Julian, 1461 equable years, commonly called the Sothiacal. If so, in the period of 120 years, of both kinds of time, both Julian and equable alike.

The decursus then of the Olympian æra being reckoned in periods of this kind, from June 25, B. C. 1240; the *fourth* such period would be found to be bearing date in the 361st year of the æra, June 25, B. C. 880: and that comes so near to any of the dates of the Olympiad of Iphitus, produced *supra*, B. C. 828, B. C. 876, B. C. 884, (especially the last two,) that this coincidence alone is competent to designate this very year, B. C. 880, (the mean between the other two,) as the actual date of that Olympiad, purposely attached to the ingress of the *fourth* period of 120 years, in the decursus of the first Sothiacal period of the æra.

It might have been due to a fortuitous concurrence of circumstances, (if any thing of that kind can be considered fortuitous,) that the time of Iphitus and Lycurgus coincided critically with the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth, of these periods, reckoned from the date of the Olympic institution of Hercules. But granting the possibility of such a coincidence *per se*, and its actual fact in the present instance, we may justly argue from it that it would probably have its effect, in suggesting the idea of the instauration or reinstitution of the games, just at the same period in the decursus of their proper æra. And as it may very probably be assumed that Iphitus in particular at this time could not have been less than 40 or 50 years of age; on that principle, he could not have been born later than B. C. 920 or 930—between which latter date and that of the birth of Hercules, B. C. 1260, the interval would be 330 years: and as the number of generations between Hercules and Iphitus is generally assumed by the ancients at ten, this



interval, spread over ten generations, would give an average of 33 years to each; which, in itself could not be considered impossible, and would agree with the calculation of the length of a generation, assumed as equivalent to one hundred years for three generations, and would shew that there must have been good grounds for the statement of the interval in question at ten generations.

SECTION X.—*On the first Historical Olympiad, B.C. 776.*

It is agreed among chronologers, both ancient and modern, that the first historical Olympiad was that of Coræbus; i. e. the Olympiad marked with the name of Coræbus—at which the conqueror in the footrace or stade was Coræbus: Ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ συνεχὲς ταῖς μνήμαις ἐπὶ ταῖς Ὀλυμπιάσιν ἐστὶ, δρόμου μὲν ἄθλα ἐτέθη πρῶτον, καὶ Ἥλείος Κόροιβος ἐνίκα<sup>i</sup>—Καίτοι καὶ ὁ πρῶτος τῶν τὸν Ὀλυμπιάσιν ἀγῶνα ἀναδησαμένων Κόροιβος ὁ Ἥλείος μάγειρος ἦν<sup>k</sup>. And this fact in *his* personal history was recorded on his monument, erected on the borders of the Elean territory<sup>l</sup>: Εἰκὼν μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοῦ Κοροΐβου τάφος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς πέρασι τῆς Ἥλείας—Τῇ δὲ Ἡραΐᾳ ὄροι πρὸς τὴν Ἥλειαν λόγῳ μὲν τῶν Ἀρκάδων ἐστὶν ὁ Ἐρύμανθος· Ἥλείοι δὲ τὸν Κοροΐβου τάφον φασὶ τὴν χώραν σφίσιν ὀρίζειν. ἦνίκα δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Ὀλυμπικὸν ἐκλείποντα ἐπὶ χρόνον πολὺν ἀνεσώσατο Ἴφιτος, καὶ αὐθις ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ὀλύμπια ἤγαγον, τότε δρόμου σφισὶν ἄθλα ἐτέθη μόνον, καὶ ὁ Κόροιβος ἐνίκησε· καὶ ἔστιν ἐπίγραμμα ἐπὶ τῷ μνήματι ὡς Ὀλυμπιάσιν ὁ Κόροιβος ἐνίκησε<sup>m</sup>, καὶ ἀνθρώπων πρῶτος, καὶ ὅτι τῆς Ἥλείας ἐπὶ τῷ πέρατι ὁ τάφος αὐτοῦ πεποιήται<sup>n</sup> \*.

From this time forward there was a regular list (*ἀναγραφὴ*, or *ἀναγραφαὶ*) of Olympic years, signed in like manner with the name of the victor in the stade in each, which Pausanias himself had inspected, and found to be complete, except in

\* This Coræbus must not be confounded with Coræbus, first of Argos, afterwards of Megara, and buried in the Agora there; a much older person, a contemporary of Crotopus, the sixth king of Argos from Phoroneus: cf. Pausanias, i. xliii. 7: ii. xvi. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Pausanias, v. viii. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Athenæus, ix. 28.

<sup>l</sup> Pausanias, v. viii. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat.

ii. 281, 282: Jerome, in Chronico, ad ann. 1240: Anecdota Græc. Parisiensia, ii. 141. 20—142. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Pausanias, viii. xxvi. 3.

some few instances, and for special reasons, which he mentions<sup>n</sup>. This register was no doubt kept (and at Elis) by the Ἑλληνοδοῖκαι, who were officially the curators and umpires of the games: but the person who made it public (whether with or without their consent, and most probably without) was Hippias the sophist, (himself of Elis also,) the contemporary of Socrates, and one of the characters in the Dialogues of Plato: Τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους ἐξακριβῶσαι χαλεπὸν ἐστὶ, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ὀλυμπιονικῶν ἀναγομένους: ὧν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ὑφέ φασι τὴν Ἰππίαν ἐκδοῦναι τὸν Ἥλελον, ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ὀρμώμενον ἀναγκαίου πρὸς πίστιν<sup>o</sup>. It is difficult to see what Plutarch intended by this observation: or what foundation would be necessary in such a case as this, except the list which the Hellenodikæ themselves had kept from the first of these Olympiads downwards. If this list of Hippias was a faithful copy of theirs, it would want no other voucher for its authenticity but that, whether published with or without the consent of those whose duty it was, and had been, to keep such a list. The Fasti were published at Rome by Cn. Flavius, much about the same time as this Olympian Register by Hippias; the former too without the consent of the pontiffs—and yet their accuracy was never called in question on that account.

Be this however as it may; it is certain that Ἀναγραφαί, professing to be a list of the entire series of Olympic victories in the stade—and of the Olympiads *in* which, and of the persons *by* whom, they were obtained—are still extant<sup>p</sup>, as low down as the 247th Olympiad, A. D. 209, in the reign of Severus, and as the 249th, A. D. 217, in that of Antoninus Caracalla; and in Dexippus' history (now lost) as low down as the 262nd, A. D. 269<sup>q</sup>, marked with the name of Dionysius of Alexandria<sup>r</sup>: after which it is superfluous to mention the lost work of Phlegon of Tralles, De Olympiadibus, in 16 books, brought down to Olymp 229, A. D. 137, the last year of Adrian, his patron<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>n</sup> vi. xxii. 1. (Phocica.)

<sup>o</sup> Plutarch, Numa, i.

<sup>p</sup> Anecdota Græca Paris. ii. 141. 30—153. 10: Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 277—313: Thes. Temp. Jerome in Chronico: cf. Syncellus, 371. 14—17: Chronicon Paschale, 193. 8—20.

<sup>q</sup> Anecdota Græca Paris. ii. 153. 25.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. Anthologia, iv. 240. Ἀδέσποτα,

DLXXXIV.

<sup>s</sup> Cf. Photius, Biblioth. Codex 97, p. 83. l. 23: Steph. Byz. Ὀλυμπίειον: Suidas, Φλέγων.

From any one of these Olympiads, and its corresponding date in the *Æra Vulgaris*, it would be easy to deduce the date of the first, B. C. 776: but this is so well known, and so generally agreed upon at present, that it may suffice to produce only the two following proofs of it.

i. Quippe certamen Olympicum, quod Hercules in honorem atavi materni Pelopis ediderat, intermissum Iphitus Eleus instauravit, post excidium Trojæ anno quadringentesimo octavo. ergo ab Iphito numeratur Olympias prima<sup>t</sup>: and directly after<sup>t</sup>, the consular year of C. Pompeius Gallus and Q. Verannius, U. C. 801 Cap.<sup>v</sup>, U. C. 802 Varr. (in either case, A. D. 49,) is reckoned the first year of Olympiad ccvii. This gives the first Olympiad  $206 \times 4$ , or 824—48 years, i. e. B. C. 776. The same conclusion follows from its date in the *æra* of Troy, according to Solinus also<sup>v</sup>, B. C. 1184—408 = B. C. 776.

ii. Secundum quam rationem (Varronianam *scil.*), nisi fallor, *hic* annus, cujus velut index et titulus quidam est Ulpii et Pontiani consulatus, (U. C. 991 of Varr. A. D. 238,) ab Olympiade prima millesimus est et quartusdecimus, ex diebus dumtaxat æstivis quibus agon Olympicus celebratur<sup>v</sup>. The 1014th year of the Olympic *æra*, reckoned from June 25, being A. D. 238, A. M. 4242; the first, reckoned from June 25, must have been A. M. 3229, B. C. 776: and the former, reduced to its place in the Olympic *æra*, would be Olymp. ccliv. 2, as Censorinus himself<sup>z</sup> says it was: for  $\overline{253} \times 4 + 1 = 1013$ .

The Olympic *æra* being treated as a cycle of *four* years from the same epoch June 25 perpetually; it is manifest that if it is supposed to have borne date June 25, B. C. 1264, Olympiad i. 1, the Olympiad of Hercules, June 25, B. C. 1240, must have corresponded to Olymp. vii. 1: that of Iphitus, June 25, B. C. 880, to Olymp. xvii. 1: that of Coræbus, June 25, B. C. 776, to Olymp. cxiii. 1. And any of the three former would have served as the epoch of an uniform reckoning of this kind, as much as the Olympiad of Coræbus. And yet the application even of this latter, for chronological

<sup>t</sup> Solinus, Polyhistor, i. 28.

<sup>v</sup> Censorinus, De Die Natali, xxi.

<sup>v</sup> Cf. our *Origines Calendariæ Italicæ*, i. 40. 45 *n.*

<sup>z</sup> Cap. xviii.

and historical purposes, was comparatively of recent date—at least if it originated with Timæus, B.C. 318—B.C. 264<sup>a</sup>.

We shall take our leave of this subject with one more observation. A statement is on record<sup>b</sup>, which professes to have been derived from Phlegon, De Olympiis, relating to the early history and administration of the games, apparently from the last of the epochs which we have just been considering, that of the Olympiad of Coræbus: Ἔστεφανώθη δὲ οὐδείς ἐπὶ πέντε Ὀλυμπιάδας· τῇ δὲ ἕκτη ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς μαντεύσασθαι εἰ στέμματα περιθῶσι τοῖς νικῶσι. καὶ πέμπουσι τὸν βασιλέα Ἴφιτον εἰς θεόν. ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἔφη τόδε.

Ἴφιτε μήλειον καρπὸν μὴ θῆς ἐπὶ νίκη,  
ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄγριον ἀμφιτίθει καρπῶδη ἔλαιον,  
ὃς νῦν ἀμφέχεται λεπτοῖσιν ὑφάσμασ' ἀράχνης.

παραγενόμενος οὖν εἰς τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν, (supple ex Phlegonte, πολλῶν ἐν τῷ τέμνει κοτίνων ὄντων,) εὐρῶν ἕνα περιεχόμενον ἀραχνίους, περιφκοδόμησεν αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς νικῶσιν ἐκ τούτου ἐδόθη ὁ στέφανος· πρῶτος δ' ἔστεφανώθη Δαΐκλῆς Μεσσήμιος, ὃς τῇ ἐβδόμῃ Ὀλυμπιάδι στάδιον ἐνίκα\*.

The Scholiast on Plato must have been aware of some such tradition as this, as may be inferred from the following passage of his scholia<sup>c</sup>; Μετὰ Πίσσον γὰρ καὶ Πέλοπα καὶ Ἡρακλέα, τοὺς πρῶτους διαθεμένους αὐτοὺς, ἡμελήθησαν ἐπὶ ὀκτῶ καὶ εἴκοσιν Ὀλυμπιάδας. Ἴφιτος δὲ καὶ Λυκούργος οἱ Ἡρακλείδαι, καὶ Κλεοσθένης ὁ Κλεονίκου, ἐπιγενόμενοι καὶ εἰς ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς Πελοποννησίους παρακαλοῦντες, πέμπουσι περὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐρωτῶντες εἰς Δελφούς. καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων χρᾶ τούτων ἀνανεοῦν, καὶ τοῖς νικῶσιν ἄθλον διδόναι κοτίνου, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀγριελαίας, στέφανου. οἱ δὲ τοῖς Ἰλλείοις ἐπιτρέπουσι διαθεῖναι τὸν ἀγῶνα, οὗτοι δὲ τοῖς Πισάταις. ἄγεται δὲ διὰ πέντε ἔτων, μέσων τεσσάρων συντελουμένων.

\* Cf. Phlegon, De Olympiadibus, ad fin. (144—147) where the original of this passage occurs.

<sup>a</sup> Cf. our Origines Kalendarix Italicæ, i. 16 n. It may indeed be inferred from Africanus, apud Eusebium, Præpar. Evang. x. 10. p. 508, 509, that some of the oldest historians, Acusilaus and Hellanicus, had recognised the Olympic Institution as an historical epoch; but it does not appear that even they had made use of

the succession of Olympic cycles, as a chronological and historical period of four years, in the way in which Timæus is said to have done, and Diodorus may still be seen to have done, and to a certain extent Polybius.

<sup>b</sup> Excerpta Vaticana of Maius, ix. i. De Olympiis, i. 48.

<sup>c</sup> ii. 405. Respubl. 246. 7.

Both these passages refer to the same occasion in general, yet differ too much in particulars for one to have been taken from the other; and the inference which may be drawn from them laid together is, that this particular incident in the administration of the games, whereby they became an *ἀγὼν στεφανίτης*, and their proper prize, in that capacity, a chaplet of wild olive leaves, must have happened in the time of Iphitus, the restorer of the games, and at the epoch of the seventh Olympiad, reckoned from that of the restoration. It is no insuperable objection that Phlegon characterizes this epoch with the name of the victor in the viith Olympiad, from the epoch of that of Coræbus, Daicles or Diocles of Messene, who actually appears as victor in the stade, Ol. vii. 1. B. C. 752. The much more important character and criterion of that Olympiad, (that it was the epoch of the first institution of the olive crown,) and in the history of this Diocles, (that he was the first who received it,) appears in none of the extant lists, and yet could not fail to have been specified, if really true of Olymp. vii. 1. B. C. 752. The Olympic cycle went on exactly in the same way from B. C. 880, Olymp. i. 1. of Iphitus, as from B. C. 776, Olymp. i. 1. of Coræbus: and there was a viith Olympiad reckoned from the former, as much as from the latter, and these were very liable *a priori* to be confounded. It is clear, from Phlegon's account of this incident, that it happened in the time of an Iphitus, a king of Elis so called, whom he himself evidently supposed to have been the restorer of the games; and if so, he could not have been living Olymp. vii. 1. B. C. 752, 128 years after B. C. 880, but he might have been so B. C. 856, Olymp. vii. 1. of his own succession of Olympiads, when, though born B. C. 930, he would not be more than 74 years of age. It is very conceivable also that the first six Olympiads of Iphitus might have been an *ἀγὼν ἀργυρίτης*, as all the oldest of these games appear to have been originally; but utterly inconceivable that the first six of those of Coræbus could have been so, if the olive crown was won by Coræbus himself at the first Olympiad, B. C. 776. This must be decisive that the games were an *ἀγὼν στεφανίτης* at that very time; as they would be, if they became so B. C. 856, Olymp. vii. 1. of Iphitus.

In the constant decursus of equable annual and nocti-diurnal time, along with Julian, the period of 120 years being of so much importance, its aliquot parts were important too; and especially the fifth part of such a period, the smaller period of 24 Julian or 24 equable years, which measured the recession of equable on Julian time through the fifth part of the equable month. The first 24 years of this kind came to an end Olymp. vii. 1. B. C. 856; and that coincidence might have something to do in fixing the time made choice of for a change like this, in the nature of the Olympic prize and in the character of the games. Be this as it may, if the olive crown was first instituted either B. C. 856 or B. C. 752, it could not have existed from the first; and therefore the tradition, of which we are made aware by the odes of Pindar, that Hercules planted the olive round about his Olympia, in order to provide the materials for that crown, from the first, must have been an invention of later times. It is another obvious inference too, from this account of the institution of the crown in question, and the circumstances under which it took place, (if it can be depended upon,) that from the time of the institution of the games by Iphitus, the Eleans, as was naturally to be expected, had the care and administration of them.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *On the Lunar Calendar of Elis.*

##### SECTION I.—*On the identity of the first Type of the Lunar Correction at Elis with the Attic Correction of Solon.*

That the Olympic games, after a certain time, must have been regulated by a Lunar Calendar, and this Lunar Calendar, some form of the Octaëteric Correction or other, might always have been inferred from the testimony of the Scholia on Pindar<sup>1</sup>: *Γίνεται δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἔννεα μηνῶν, ποτὲ δὲ διὰ πενήτηκοντα.* For from this testimony

<sup>1</sup> Olymp. iii. 35. vide supra, page 497.

it appears there were in every two Olympic cycles 49 + 50, or 99, lunar months, which is the number contained in one octaëteric cycle.

And not only so, but from the language of this old commentator, which seems to have been purposely studious of precision, it might be inferred likewise that the proper intercalary years of this Olympic octaëteris must have been the *third*, the *fifth*, and the *eighth*, just as they were in the octaëteric cycle of the Greeks in general; for on that supposition only could it have happened that the first of two given Olympic cycles would contain 49 months, and the next 50; the former the sum of the months in the first four years of the old Hellenic octaëteris, the latter in the last four.

It might also be collected from this testimony that the proper Olympic years in such a cycle, must have been the middle of the *first* and the middle of the *fifth*; that the Olympic games being regularly celebrated in such a cycle *twice*, but *once* after an interval of 49 months, and *again* after one of 50, they must have been celebrated in the former case in the middle of the *fifth* year of their proper octaëteric cycle, and in the latter in that of the *first*.

Now these are criteria of the Olympic octaëteris which serve to identify it with the first Lunar Correction of the Primitive Solar Calendar, among the Greeks, the octaëteric Correction of Solon, B. C. 592. It was peculiar to that to have been made public in the last year of Olymp. xlv. or the first of Olymp. xlvii. The regular Olympic years consequently in that type of the Hellenic octaëteris were necessarily the *first* and the *fifth*, and the middle of each respectively; exactly as those of the proper Olympic octaëteris appear to have been: from which it may justly be inferred, in our opinion, that this octaëteric correction of Solon and the proper Olympic octaëteris were the same\*.

We may therefore conclude with every presumption of

\* There were two types of the octaëteris, later than this, which the Eleans might have adopted if they had pleased, the second, B. C. 567, and the third, B. C. 542. But in the former the proper Olympic years must have been the *fourth* and the *eighth*, in the latter the *third* and the *seventh*. In no type but the first, could the proper Olympic years have been what they appear to have been, the *first* and the *fifth*, or the *fifth* and the *first*.

certainly, that the lunar Olympic calendar and the lunar calendar of the Athenians, from the time of Solon downwards, were the same; and if the *Olympic* calendar, in all probability the *civil* calendar of the Eleans too. The next question is that of the date of the adoption of this Olympic calendar, and whether so early as B. C. 592, or some later date.

SECTION II.—*On the date of the adoption of the Lunar Calendar for the regulation of the Olympic Games.*

The octaëteric correction of Solon having come into use at Athens, and no doubt become known to the rest of the Greeks, Gamelion 1, cycle i. 1. January 19, B. C. 592, six months before the stated date of Olymp. xlvii. June 25, the same year, it was a possible case that it might have been adopted in time to be applied to the celebration of these very games; but whether that was actually done or not, is a question of fact, which cannot be decided by probable reasons. And in the absence of positive testimony, without stopping to insist on any other objection to the supposition that it *was* done, we may be satisfied to mention the following.

The stated and regular dates of the Olympic feriæ, Olymp. xlvii. 1, would be June 25–30; and June 25–30, B. C. 592, coinciding with Skirrhophorion 11–16, Cycle i. 1, of the correction of Solon—it is evident that, whether any such coincidence was intended at the time or not, Olymp. xlvii, celebrated according to rule, June 25–30, B. C. 592, must have been celebrated Skirrhophorion 11–16, Cycle i. 1, of the Octaëteric correction of Solon. Now, if this coincidence was both contemplated and intended at the time, the Olympic feriæ, determined in this first instance to Skirrhophorion 11–16, must have continued attached to them ever after; i. e. the stated Olympic month from this time forward must have been Skirrhophorion in the Attic, and the corresponding month in the Elcan, calendar, (in other words, the *sixth* in the Olympic Octaëteris,) and the stated Olympic feriæ, the six lunar terms in that month, from the 11th to the 16th. But we know from testimony, that the stated Olympic month in this Octaëteris was the seventh, the month which corresponded to the Attic Hecatombaon; and the stated Olympic feriæ



were the six lunar terms, from the 11th to the 16th of that month.

We must conclude therefore that even though the Octaëteric correction might have been adopted by the Eleans, for any other use and purpose, B. C. 592 itself, it could not have been applied at that time to the regulation of the Olympic games, nor consequently earlier than the next Olympiad, Olymp. xlviii. 1. (Cycle i. 5, B. C. 588. At this time the six lunar terms (the 11th to the 16th of the lunar month), which in the first year of the cycle, B. C. 592, Olymp. xlvii. 1, corresponded to the *Mensis Cronius*, June 25-30, supposed to be those of the sixth month of the cycle, would be found falling June 10-15; supposed to be those of the seventh, would be found falling July 10-15: and the Eleans would have to decide which of these should be assumed, as the stated Olympic feriae in the Olympic Octaëteric cycle, both then, and ever after. Neither of these, it is evident, were coinciding at this time with the six solar terms of the old *Mensis Cronius*, June 25-30; but the former it is observable were falling fifteen days before the first of these terms, June 25, and the latter fifteen days after it. Now, to have assumed the former as the Olympic feriae would have offended against the analogy of the old rule, according to which these feriae could not possibly anticipate on June 25, the summer solstitial date in the sphere of Mazzaroth; but to assume the latter, might appear to be agreeable to it, because, even by the old rule, though the first of the Olympic feriae could never anticipate on June 25, the last always fell five days later.

Under these circumstances, it is easy to see that the sixth month in the Olympic Octaëteris, the month which corresponded to the Attic Skirrhophorion, Cycle i. 5, Olymp. xlviii. 1, could not be assumed as the proper Olympic month, nor the six lunar terms of this month, the 11th to the 16th, as the proper Olympic feriae; and therefore that the seventh month, which corresponded to the Attic Hecatombaion, and the six lunar terms of this month, Hecatombaion 11-16, must be assumed in their stead. And this having been done in this first instance, everything else would follow as matter of course. The seventh month, in the proper Olympic Octaë-

teris, would become the proper Olympic month; and the six lunar terms in that month, from the 11th to the 16th, would be the proper Olympic feriæ in the proper years of the cycle ever after. And the Julian dates of these lunar terms, in the first year of the cycle, being July 25–30, and in the fifth, being July 10–15, if these lunar terms continued attached to the same solar terms in the same years of the cycle, these Julian dates of the Olympic feriæ in the first year of the cycle would never be anything but July 25–30, nor in the fifth, anything but July 10–15. But if they did not continue attached to the same solar terms in the same years of the cycle perpetually (i. e. if they followed the moon), their Julian dates would be liable to rise also, and could not continue the same for more than one cycle at the utmost. The question therefore which we have next to consider is *this*: whether the Olympic feriæ, having been once attached to the six lunar terms from the 11th to the 16th of the proper Olympic month, (the seventh month in the proper Olympic calendar,) followed the moon? and so rose with successive cycles on the six solar terms to which they were at first attached.

SECTION III.—*On the liability of the Olympic Feriæ in their proper Lunar Calendar to follow the Moon.*

The tendency of the lunar dates in the Octaëteric cycle to advance upon the solar, from the beginning to the end of the Octaëteric Period, has often been alluded to; and not to repeat what we have frequently observed, that if this property of the cycle was so well known to the ancient Greeks from the time of Solon downwards, it is not likely it would be disregarded by the Eleans in adjusting the details and administration of their proper Olympic calendar, but to treat this question, Whether the proper Olympic feriæ in the proper Olympic month, from the time of the adoption of the proper Olympic Octaëteris at Elis, were fixed or moveable in terms of the calendar, as a simple question of fact, which must be decided by testimony—we may begin with appealing to a very important passage in the Scholia Vetera on Pindar, which, though grievously corrupted in the state in which it has come down to us, is nevertheless sufficiently intelligible

to throw much light on this point. We shall produce it exactly as it is given in Mr. Boeckh's edition of Pindar<sup>11</sup>.

Περὶ τοῦ χρόνου καθ' ὃν ἄγεται τὰ Ὀλύμπια καθ' ἑκάστην Ὀλυμπιάδα ... ὁ τὰ περὶ ... συντάξας φησὶν οὕτω. Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν παρτὸς Περιόδου συνέθηκεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀρχεῖν τουμηγίας μηνὸς ὃς Διόσθνος ἐν Ἰλλιδι ὀνομάζεται, περὶ ὃν τροπαὶ ἡλίου γίνονται χειμεριναί. καὶ πρῶτα Ὀλύμπια ἄγεται ἢ μηνί. ἐνὸς δὲ ὄντος (sc. τοῦ ἀγῶνος) διαφερότων (lege διαφέρει) τῇ ὥρᾳ, τὰ μὲν ἀρχόμενα τῆς ὀπώρας, τὰ δὲ ὑπ' αὐτὸν τὸν ἀρκτουρον. ὅτι δὲ ἄγεται ὁ ἀγὼν καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος μαρτυρεῖ\*.

There can be no question that the Olympic cycle here described must have been regulated not by the Metonic, but the Octaëteric correction. Thus much is clear from this testimony even as it stands: i. That the epoch of this Olympic calendar was attached to the month which coincided with the winter solstice. Now, in the Attic calendar, this was Posideon; and if the Olympic calendar was originally the same as the Attic, this month in that must have been absolutely the same with Posideon in the Attic. ii. That, as reckoned from this month which coincided with the solstice, the Olympic month was the eighth; on which principle, Posideon being assumed as the solstitial month, the Olympic month must have been Hecatombæon. iii. That the proper date of the Olympia as celebrated in *this* month, relatively to the natural year, was the beginning of the ὀπώρα—for that must be the meaning of this part of the original, ἀρχόμενα τῆς ὀπώρας—especially, when corrected, as it evidently requires to be, by ἀρχομένης τῆς ὀπώρας. Now the beginning of the ὀπώρα in the solar Parapegmata of the Greeks was the

\* Mr. B.'s note on the above is as follows: "Ubi lacunas notavi est κῶμ aut κῶμος ὁ τὰ περικλείων. deinde συγκατάξας pro συντάξας, et τουμηγίαν. mox θωσυσθίας haud veritus sum mutare in Διόσθνος, qui mensis notus ex Dorico monumento apud Gruterum p. cexvii. et Maffei. Mus. Veron. p. xv."

In our opinion the source of this scholium was Ἀριστόδημος, an author sometimes quoted as ὁ τὰ περὶ Ἡλείων γράψας or συντάξας: and it must have been taken from that part of his account which related to the proper rule of the games in the Olympian calendar, or to the construction of the Olympian calendar itself.

<sup>11</sup> Scholia, ad Olymp. iii. 33.

heliacal rising of Sirius; which Meton<sup>o</sup> dated Karkinon 25, July 21, Euctemon and Eudoxus, Karkinon 27, July 23, Callippus, Karkinon 30, July 26, and Euctemon again, Leonton 1, July 28: and any one of these (and especially the last two) would agree in a remarkable manner to the original dates of the Olympic feriæ in the first year of the Octaëteris of Solon, July 25–30; so much so, that in describing their relation to the natural year, this ancient author, whosoever he was, might have been describing our Olympic calendar, and not that of the Eleans.

iv. What is still more observable, it appears from the same testimony that the Olympia had a double relation to the natural year, Τὰ μὲν ἀρχομένης τῆς ὀπώρας, τὰ δὲ ὑπ' αὐτὸν τὸν ἄρκτουρον. This latter means the heliacal rising of Arcturus; and the heliacal rising of Arcturus, in the Greek Parapegmata, was the beginning of the φθινόπωρον, as that of Sirius was of the ὀπώρα: and what is here asserted of the Olympic rule is that, while the Olympia could not fall earlier than the beginning of the ὀπώρα, they might fall as late as the beginning of the φθινόπωρον. There were two dates of the heliacal rising of Arcturus in the solar calendar of Meton, September 6 and September 16; and between the first of these, and the last of the Olympic feriæ, in the first year of the Olympic octaëteris, July 30, there could not be less than 38 days' interval.

On this principle, the earliest and the latest dates of the Olympic feriæ must have been liable to differ asunder by more, or at least by not less, than one *lunar month*. There can be but one mode of explaining a seeming anomaly like that; viz. by supposing that, though attached at first to the beginning of the ὀπώρα, they were liable to advance to the beginning of the φθινόπωρον; and therefore must have followed the moon. It is observable however, that even this liability to advance from the ὀπώρα to the φθινόπωρον is expressed by ὑπ' αὐτὸν τὸν ἄρκτουρον; which does not necessarily imply that they might get within the actual limits of the φθινόπωρον, as defined by the heliacal rising of Arcturus, only that they were liable to approach to them. The Olympic calendar which we ourselves have constructed, in conformity to the proper rule

<sup>o</sup> Apud Geminum; see Uranologium, 64.

of the Olympic feriæ, as liable to be affected by the Lunar Precession, explains this at once<sup>p</sup>; for we have only to turn to it to see that B. C. 592, Period i. 1, Cycle i. 1, Olymp. xlvii. 1, these feriæ were falling July 25–30; and B. C. 432, Period ii. 1, Cycle i. 1, Olymp. lxxxvii. 1. had they not been previously corrected, and brought back to their original solar dates, according to the rule by which they had been regulated until then they would have fallen August 21–29, or August 25–30, only a few days short of the earlier of the two dates of the rising of Arcturus in the sidereal calendar of Meton, Sept. 6.

There can consequently be no doubt that the Olympic rule, which this author intended to describe, must have been cyclical; the only one which could have place in an octaëteric calendar, in which the true lunar characters of particular observances were constantly taken into account, and therefore of necessity followed the moon. And this is confirmed by the matter of fact, in the case of Olymp. lxxv. 1, which coincided with the year of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes. B. C. 480; the date of which we determined from circumstantial evidence<sup>q</sup> to August 15–20, exactly as our Olympic calendar<sup>p</sup> shews it—21 days in advance of the same lunar terms in the same year of the cycle, B. C. 592, July 25–30, but still only the exact amount of the Lunar Precession in 112 years<sup>r</sup>, from Period i. 1, Cycle i. 1, B. C. 592, to Period i. 113, Cycle xv. 1, B. C. 480.

With regard then to the question, whether the solar dates of the Olympic feriæ, as determined and laid down at first in the proper Olympic calendar, were fixed or moveable, the testimony of this author, confirmed by the evidence of the fact itself, in so memorable and well-attested an instance as that of Olymp. lxxv. B. C. 480, can leave no doubt that they were liable to advance on the epochs to which they were originally attached; they were liable to be affected by the Precession peculiar to the octaëteric cycle, and therefore must have followed the moon, through their proper octaëteric period.

In other respects, the octaëteris described by this author

<sup>p</sup> Vol. vi. Appendix, Table ii.  
<sup>r</sup> Vol. i. page 42.

<sup>q</sup> Vol. i. 374.

could not have differed from that of Solon, except in being so contrived as to bear date on the first of the second Posideon, instead of the first of Gamelion. And the second Posideon being necessarily a full month, the first month in this calendar must have been a full one too, and its months must have alternated 30 and 29, instead of 29 and 30. But such distinctions were merely accidental; and it would be easy to delineate this Olympic octaëteris, by merely taking the last month of the Attic, whether the first or the second Posideon, and proposing it as the first of the Olympic, under the name of Diosthyus.

*Scheme of the Olympic Octaëteris, according to the author quoted in the Scholia on Pindar.*

B. C.	Attic.		Days.	Olympic.		Days.	Month.
593—592	*viii	Poseidon	B	30	i	Diosthyus	30 Dec. 20
592—591	i	—	A		ii	—	— 9
591—590	ii	—	A		*iii	—	Nov. 28
590—*589	*iii	—	B		iv	—	Dec. 17
589—588	iv	—	A		*v	—	— 5
588—587	*v	—	B		vi	—	— 24
587—586	vi	—	A		vii	—	— 13
586—*585	vii	—	A		*viii	—	— 2

The eighth month, reckoned from Diosthyus, in one of these schemes, and from Posideon in the other, in every year of the cycle would be just the same; and the Julian date of the 11th of that month, the first of the Olympic feriae, would be the same too. But with respect to this *eleventh*, the peculiar language of the author in question, *Περίοδον συνέθηκεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀρχεῖν νουμηρίας κ', τ. λ.*—if it can be depended on as it stands—may lead us to suspect that in his apprehension the day of the new moon, and the first of the month, in any of these instances, might not be the same; and therefore it was that he designated the epoch of the reckoning of the months, in the calendar which he was describing, not by the *νουμηρία* absolutely, which would have denoted the first of the month, but the *ἡμέρα νουμηρίας*, the *day of a new moon*, which could denote only the first of the moon. We may presume then that he had in view a cycle of lunations, which was always attached to the first of the moon, but not neces-

sarily to the first of the month; and that would be a proper description of an octaëteric cycle, in which an assumed epochal term followed the moon, and therefore was liable to change its place relatively to the sun. In other words, the Olympic calendar of this author bore date on the new moon of Diosthyus or Posideon, and his eighth month on the new moon of Apollonius or Hecatombæon: and his Olympic feriæ on the eleventh of that moon, perpetually.

SECTION IV.—*On the Olympiad of Cleisthenes, and the inference from it, respecting the dates of successive cycles of the Olympic Octaëteris.*

There is one question however, connected with the Olympic octaëteris and its proper rule of administration, about which *a priori* there is room for doubt, and on which no light is thrown by the preceding testimony. The Lunar Precession in this cycle amounted to a day and an half in one cycle, and to three days in two cycles<sup>s</sup>; and consequently, *a priori*, there would seem to have been equally good reason to advance the epoch two days at the end of the first cycle, and one at the end of the second, as, *vice versa*, one at the end of the first, and two at the end of the second. In the administration of the other octaëteric calendars of the Greeks, the rule adopted *de facto* appears to have been the latter; but, in this Olympic one, we have seen reason to conclude it was the former. But this is far from being a certain point; and the proof of it which we have to produce turns on so nice and critical a coincidence, that the reader may very possibly not think it conclusive. We shall however lay it before him, and leave him to judge of it for himself.

Herodotus tells us<sup>t</sup> that Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sikyon, having just won the victory in the chariot race at the Olympic games, took advantage of the occasion to proclaim to the assembled Greeks, that he was ready to bestow his daughter in marriage upon any of them, who, after a year's trial of a certain kind, should approve himself as the most deserving of her. Ὀλυμπίων ὧν ἐόντων, καὶ νικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖσι τεθρίππῳ ὁ Κλεισθένης. κήρυγμα ἐποίησατο, ὅστις Ἑλλήνων ἐωϊτόν ἀξιοῖ

<sup>s</sup> See Vol. i. page 35.

<sup>t</sup> vi. 126.

Κλεισθένης γαμβρὸν γενέσθαι, ἦκειν ἐς ἑξηκοστὴν ἡμέραν ἢ καὶ πρότερον ἐς Σικυώνα· ὡς κυρώσαντος Κλεισθένης τὸν γάμον ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξηκοστῆς ἀρξαμένου ἡμέρης.

It is an obvious conjecture that this proclamation was made on the day of the *Κρίσις*, the sixth of the Olympic feriæ; and as the Greek calendar at this time everywhere, except among the Athenians, the Ionians, the Spartans, the Bœotians, and the Eleans themselves, was still the primitive solar one, it may also be conjectured that the last day of the games in this instance coincided with the first day of one of the months of the primitive solar calendar.

The time of Cleisthenes, according to Mr. Clinton<sup>v</sup>, might go as far back as B. C. 595, and could not come down later than B. C. 548; but as Cleisthenes, the offspring of this marriage of Agariste, his daughter, to Megacles, the son of Alcmaeon, was the same who took so leading a part at Athens, after the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, and made so many changes in the constitution there, we may presume that he could not have been either much more or much less than of the proper archontic age, (41 or 42,) about B. C. 510<sup>x</sup>, and therefore must have been born about B. C. 551, or 550. If then he was born the year after the marriage of Agariste and Megacles, they could not have been married later than B. C. 551, and therefore the Olympiad before their marriage must have been Olympiad lvii. B. C. 552\*.

\* There is no chronological difficulty in Herodotus' account of the Megacles who married the daughter of Cleisthenes, except what is implied by his placing him in the second generation after Cræsus<sup>1</sup>, Alcmaeon his father having been a contemporary of Cræsus<sup>2</sup>. The reign of Cræsus came between B. C. 560 and 546; and this statement of Herodotus' may be understood to mean that Megacles, the son of Alcmaeon, any time in that reign, was arrived at man's estate, as he could not fail to have been if he married Agariste, B. C. 551<sup>3</sup>.

Megacles had two sons by Agariste, Cleisthenes and Hippocrates; and Agariste, who married Xanthippus, and was the mother of Pericles, was the daughter of Hippocrates<sup>4</sup>. Pericles died B. C. 429, at little less than

<sup>v</sup> Fasti Hell. i. ad ann. 595. cf. pag. 369 also ii. 297, 298. <sup>x</sup> See supra, vol. iv. 157: v. 33. 112. cf. also Mr. Clinton's F. Hell. ii. 343, 344 note p.

<sup>1</sup> vi. 126.

Histor. v. and i. 573-582. Histor. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> vi. 127. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Herod. vi. 131.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Tzetzes, Chiliad, i. 197. 204:



Now by our Olympic calendar  $\gamma$ , the Olympic feriae of this Olympiad, were August 2–7, and the last of them was August 7. And by the primitive calendar also, *Æra Cyclica* 3155, when *Thoth I* was falling Jan. 9, B. C. 552, at midn. the primitive *Pharmuthi* was falling on August 7, at midn.; and the day of the *Kρίσις*, and the first of the month in the primitive calendar, as we conjectured, this year were the same. The sixty days consequently would extend from the first of the primitive *Pharmuthi* to the first of the primitive *Paüni*. And the year of trial, which was to begin after the expiration of these two months, would begin on the first of the primitive *Paüni*, October 6, B. C. 552, and last to the first of the same month, October 6, B. C. 551. On this principle, the marriage of *Agariste* and *Megacles* would take place October 6, B. C. 551, and *Cleisthenes*, their son, might be born B. C. 550, and would be 12, B. C. 509, which is as probable a date as any which could be assigned to his reforms and changes at Athens, the beginning of which could not have been earlier than B. C. 510. But these coincidences after all depend on the rule of the administration of the Olympic octaëteric cycle, and whether it was the same with respect to the rise of the epochs as the Attic, or different from it. If it was the same, the Olympic feriae, *Olymp. lvii.* must have been Aug. 1—August 6, and the date of the *Kρίσις* must have been August 6, the 30th of the primitive *Phamenoth*, and not the first of the primitive *Pharmuthi*.

SECTION V.—*On the second Type of the Lunar Correction of Elis, or the Metonic Calendar of Elis, and its beginning.*

The statement of the Scholiast on *Pindar*<sup>z</sup> respecting the

80 years of age<sup>5</sup>. Consequently he must have been born soon after B. C. 509; and if *Agariste* his mother was then about 15 years old, she too must have been born about B. C. 524, at which time her father *Hippocrates* might have been 25 years old.

These facts are consistent with the hypothesis that the Olympia of *Cleisthenes* were Olympiad *lvii.* B. C. 552, and that *Agariste* and *Megacles* were married B. C. 551.

$\gamma$  Vol. vi. Appendix, Table ii.

<sup>z</sup> *Supra*, 574.

<sup>5</sup> See the *Fasti* of Mr. Clinton, ad Ann. 429.

number of months between any two repetitions of the Olympic games, sometimes 49, sometimes 50, would be as true of the cycle in the Metonic, as in the octaëteric, calendar; because the Metonic cycle itself was only the octaëteric repeated as often as the length of the cycle would admit, and the intercalary rule of both, as far as they were commensurable one with the other, was the same. And as he proceeded to mention two months also, in one of which the games were celebrated at one time, and in the other at another, Parthenius and Apollonius, it is probable that what he had in his eye, when he made the observation, was the Metonic cycle, in which this incidence of the stated date of the games in two different months was *a priori* possible, but not in the octaëteric. By the rule of the games in this latter cycle, the month Parthenius, as answering to Skirrhophorion, was altogether excluded; and they could fall out in no month but Apollonius, as the same with Hecatombæon—at least in the true moon of no month but that, though they might nominally get into the moon of Metageitnion.

Now as we have seen every reason to conclude that the octaëteric correction of the Athenians must have been adopted by the Eleans, and applied to the regulation of the Olympic games, from the first, so is there just the same reason to believe that the Metonic correction was substituted at Elis even sooner than it was at Athens, and that the beginning of the year was changed there, when this was done, as it was at Athens.

We infer this fact from the following testimony of Pausanias, speaking of the umpires or judges of the games, whose official title was that of the Ἑλληνοδίκαι. These Hellenodikæ had a building at Elis, expressly appropriated to them, called the Ἑλληνοδικαίων, where they resided all together. Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν στοᾶν, says he<sup>a</sup>, ἴόντι ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν, ἔστιν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ παρὰ τὸ πέρασ τῆς στοᾶς ὁ Ἑλληνοδικαίων· ἀγνιὰ δὲ ἡ διεργουσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐστὶν αὐτόν. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ Ἑλληνοδικαίῳ οἰκοῦσι δέκα ἐφεξῆς μῆνας οἱ αἰρεθέριτες Ἑλληνοδικεῖν\*, καὶ ὑπὸ

\* With respect to these Hellenodikæ, whose proper title appears to have been always expressed in the Doric form of Ἑλληνοδίκαι, the earliest refer-

τῶν ῥομοφυλάκων ὅσα ἐς τὸν ἀγῶνα σφᾶς δεῖ ποιεῖν διδάσκονται. It seems then that these umpires were appointed to their

ence would be that which we quoted supra from Pindar<sup>1</sup>. The Scholiast observes on that passage, that the Hellenodikēs was an Ætolian, descended from the followers of Oxylyus, the leader of a colony of Ætolians, which accompanied the Heraclidæ, (when they recovered the Peloponnese,) and settled at Elis. Αἰτωλοὶ πρῶτοι ἐγένοντο Ἑλληνοδῖκαι ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, (καὶ) ὅτι ὁ κτιστὴς τῆς Ἡλίδος Ὁξέυλος Αἰτωλὸς ἦν. He observes again, Ἑλληνοδῖκαι καλοῦνται οἱ προτεταγμένοι τοῦ ἀγῶνος, ἐπεὶ μόνοι Ἕλληνες ἀγωνίζονται. . . οὕτω γὰρ ἐστέφοντο ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου. Ἀνακρέων

Ἐπὶ δ' ὀφρύσιν σελίνων στέφανον θέμενοι.

He adds: Περὶ δὲ τοῦ τῶν Ἑλληνοδικῶν ἀριθμοῦ, Ἑλλάδικός φησι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον β', τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ι'. τοσαῦται γὰρ αἱ τῶν Ἡλείων φυλαί, καὶ ἐφ' ἐκάστη εἷς ἦν Ἑλληνοδῖκης. So also Harpocration: Ἀριστοτέλης Ἡλείων πολιτεία τὸ μὲν πρῶτόν φησιν ἕνα καταστήσαι τοὺς Ἡλείους Ἑλληνοδῖκην, χρόνου δὲ διελεύθους β', τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον θ'. Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ὁ Ἡλείος φησι τοὺς τελευταίους τιθέντας τὸν ἀγῶνα Ἑλληνοδικὰς εἶναι ι', ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἕνα<sup>2</sup>.

Ἑλληνοδῖκαι<sup>3</sup> ἄρχοντες Ἡλείοι διέποντες τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν Ὀλυμπιακόν. . . ἐκαθέζοντο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι πορφυρίδα περιβεβλημένοι· καὶ ἦσαν οὗτοι τὸ μὲν πάλαι ἑννέα· εἶτα δύο· καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἧ'—Ἑλληνοδῖκης<sup>4</sup>. . . ἄρχοντες τινες Ἡλείων οἱ διέποντες τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ὀλυμπίων. . . ἐδίκαζον δὲ τοῖς τε ἀθληταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀγωνισταῖς· καὶ προεκάθητο ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι ἐν πορφυρίσιν. ἦσαν δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν ἑννέα, εἶτα δέκα, εἶτα (πεντήκοντα) (ἧ') τὸ τελευταῖον.

Hesychius gives the presidents of the games the name of Αἰσυμνήται· Οἱ τοῦ ἀγῶνος προεστῶτες—which, according to Aristotle, was rather the name of the constitutional king or monarch, in these early times<sup>5</sup>, in opposition to the Τύραννος of after times. He calls the Ἑλληνοδῖκαι also Διάρχοι<sup>6</sup>: and though he has Ἑλληνοδῖκαι τοο, (οἱ κριταί, οἱ καθήμενοι εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας,) this would imply that the judges so called had no more to do with the Olympic games, than with any other among the Greeks.

Another name of office connected with the Olympic games was that of Ἀλυτάρχης: on which the Etym. in voce has, Ὁ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ὀλυμπιακῷ ἀγῶνι εὐκοσμίας ἄρχων. Ἡλείοι γὰρ τοῖς μάγδοσφύροισι ἢ μαστιγοσφύροισι παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις καλουμένους ἀλύτας καλοῦσι, καὶ τὸν τούτων ἄρχοντα Ἀλυτάρχην. Hedyllus, a commentator on the Epigrams of Callimachus, wrote this name Ἀλλύτας<sup>7</sup>, which implies that the first syllable in ἀλύτης (though probably not the second) was short. These ἀλύται were a kind of serjeants, apparitors, or lictors, who must have been subject to the Hella-

1 Page 489. Olymp. iii. 19-24.

2 Cf. Suidas in voce.

3 Etym. M.

4 Anecdota Græca, 248. 32.

5 See Vol. i. 308, note.

6 In voce.

7 Ibid. cf. also the Anecdota Græca Paris. iv. 6. 20. Ἀλυτάρχης.

office *ten* months before they entered upon the discharge of its duties, and all that time, in fact, they were learning to

nodikæ, and by whom they enforced order and regularity at the games\*. Of the use of the rod at the Olympic games, the well-known story of Themistocles and Adimantus, or Eurybiades<sup>8</sup>, is a sufficient illustration.

The most particular account of the Hellenodikæ, and of their numbers at different times, is given by Pausanias<sup>9</sup>, beginning Olymp. i. B. C. 580, when they were *two* in number. Olymp. xxv. (or rather lxxvii.) B. C. 472, their number was *nine*; three for the horse-race, three for the Pentathlon and foot-race<sup>10</sup>, and three for the rest of the games. A *tenth* was added, Olymp. lxxix, B. C. 464<sup>10</sup>. Olymp. ciii, B. C. 368, their number was *twelve*; one for each tribe at Elis: Olymp, civ, B. C. 364, it was *eight*, four tribes having been lost meanwhile<sup>11</sup>. Olymp. cviii, B. C. 348, they again became *ten*; and this continued to be their number ever after, down to Pausanias' time, though the number of the tribes in *his* time was only *eight*<sup>12</sup>. This number is recognised by Philostratus, in his Vita Apollonii<sup>13</sup>: 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ ὦ Ἀπολλώνιε καὶ τὰ Ἡλείων πάτρια Αἰγυπτίων ἀκούοντες, καὶ τοὺς Ἑλλανοδικὰς οὖς προίστανται τῶν Ὀλυμπίων δέκα ὄντας, οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν τὸν νόμον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσι κείμενον, . . . ὁ γὰρ τῶν δέκα ἀριθμὸς ἀπαραίτητος ὢν, . . . ἢ οὐκ ὄντων δικαίων δέκα . . . οὐδεὶς δόξει.

There is an account of Apollonius' visit to Olympia<sup>14</sup>, which we have already determined to Olymp. ccx, A. D. 61, when the games were celebrated Apollonius 11-16, July 23-28. It is observed at that time<sup>15</sup>: Παρταυγῶνων δὲ τοῖς δρωμένοις ἀπεδέχετο τῶν Ἡλείων ὡς ἐπεμελοῦντο τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ξὺν κόσμῳ ἔδρων, μείων τε οὐδὲν ἢ (οἱ) ἀγωνιούμενοι τῶν ἀθλητῶν κρῖνεσθαι ᾤοντο, καὶ μηθ' ἐκόντες τι μητ' ἄκοντες ἀμαρτάνειν προνοοῦντο.

Pausanias<sup>16</sup>: Καὶ ταύτη τοὺς Ἑλλανοδικὰς ἵεναὶ καθέστηκεν ἐς τὸ γυμνάσιον. εἰρίασι δὲ πρὶν μὲν τὸν ἥλιον ἀνίσχειν, συμβαλόντες δρομέας. μεσοῦσης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τὸ πένταθλον, καὶ ὕσα βαρέα ἄλλα ὀνομαζοῦσιν—Cf. Philostratus<sup>17</sup>: Καταγωγὴν δὲ ἀποχρῶσαν τοῖς ξένοις ἐδείμαντο στοὰν οὐ μεγάλην, ἰσομήκη ταῖς Ἡλείων, ὑφ' αἷς ὁ ἀθλητῆς περιμένει τὸ μεσημβρινὸν κήρυγμα.

In Lucian, there is a *locus classicus*, relative to the way in which the candidates were matched together<sup>18</sup>: Οἶμαι δὲ σε, ὦ Ἐρμώτιμε, καὶ ἀγῶνας ἡδὴ γυμνικοὺς ἑωρακεῖναι πολλὰκις . . . ἢ οὐν πότε καὶ παρὰ τοὺς ἀθλοθέτας αὐ-

\* The Ἀλυτάρχης, or chief of these ἀλύται, is distinguished from the Hellenodikæ in Lucian, i. 783. 27 Hermotimus, 40: though the same passage implies that he must have been the next in authority to them; and just before it speaks of one of these ἀλύται by the name of ὁ μαστιγοφόρος.

<sup>8</sup> Herodotus, viii. 59: Plut. Themist.

xi.

<sup>9</sup> v. ix. 4, 5.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. vi. iii. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. v. xvi. 5.

<sup>12</sup> v. xvi. 5.

<sup>13</sup> iii. ix. 137. B-D.

14 iv. viii. 180, 181.

15 iv. ix. 186 C.

16 vi. xxiv. 1.

17 vi. iv. 265 D.

18 Opp. i. 782. Hermotimus, sive De Sectis, 39, 95.

discharge its duties. The athletes too, it appears, were subjected to a preparatory discipline for the same length of time, before they were allowed to contend at last<sup>b</sup>: Οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀθληταὶ καὶ τότε ἐτι προτκατόμννται, δέκα ἐφεξῆς μηνῶν ἀπηκριβῶσθαί σφισι τὰ πάντα ἐς ἄσκησιν\*.

τὸς ἐκαθέζω; Ἑρμ. Νῆ Δία ἔναγχος Ὀλυμπιάσιν ἐπὶ τὰ λαῖα τῶν Ἑλληνοδικῶν, Εὐανδρίδου τοῦ Ἥλείου θεῶν μοι προκαταλαβόντος ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολιταῖς. ἐπεθύμουν γὰρ ἐγγύθεν ἅπαντα ὄρᾶν τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλληνοδικαῖς γιγνόμενα—Οἶσθα οὖν καὶ τοῦτο, πῶς κληροῦσιν ὄντινα ᾧτιμι χρῆ παλαίειν ἢ παγκρατιάζειν; Οἶδα γάρ—

Κάλπις ἀργυρᾷ πρόκειται ἱερὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐς ταύτην ἐμβάλλονται κλῆροι μικροὶ, ὅσον δὴ κυμαῖοι τὸ μέγεθος, ἐπιγεγραμμένοι. ἐγγράφεται δὲ ἐς δύο μὲν ἄλφα ἐν ἑκατέρῳ· ἐς δύο δὲ τὸ βῆτα· καὶ ἐς ἄλλους δύο τὸ γάμμα κ', τ. λ. προσελθὼν δὴ τῶν ἀθλητῶν ἕκαστος, προσευξάμενος τῷ Διῖ, καθεῖς τὴν χεῖρα ἐς τὴν κάλπιν ἀνασπᾶ τῶν κλήρων ἕνα· καὶ μετ' ἐκείνον ἕτερος· καὶ παρεστῶς μαστιγοφόρος ἐκάστῳ ἀνέχει αὐτοῦ τὴν χεῖρα, οὐ παρέχων ἀναγῶναι ὅ τι τὸ γράμμα ἐστὶν ὃ ἀνέσπακεν κ', τ. λ.<sup>19</sup>

\* Tzetzes, in Lycoph.<sup>1</sup>, limits this preparatory training of the Athletes to one month only before the actual time of the games—Προεγυμνάζοντο δὲ πρόην ἡμέρας λ'—and Philostratus also seems to assert the same thing<sup>2</sup>: Ἥλείοι τοὺς ἀθλητὰς, ἐπειδὴν ἦκη Ὀλύμπια, γυμνάζουσιν ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἥλίδι. But whatsoever might be the case in later times, we have no doubt that the ancient rule is correctly specified by Pausanias. Vitruvius tells us that the Xystus, or covered portico, made part of the Palaestra everywhere; in order that the Athletes might be able to exercise themselves in the winter, as well as in the spring or summer<sup>3</sup>: Hæc autem porticus Ξυστὸς apud Græcos vocitatur, quod athlete per hiberna tempora in tectis stadiis exercentur<sup>4</sup>. Yet, if all the training which the candidates had to undergo against the Olympic games, was confined to the month before them, this winter gymnasium at Elis must have been superfluous, though there was one there too<sup>4</sup>.

Philostratus himself, in the sequel of the same passage, contrasts the strictness of the Elean rule, with the Delphian, or the Corinthian, as follows: Καὶ ξυναγρόντες αὐτοὺς (scil. τοὺς ἀθλητὰς) ὁ μὲν Δελφὸς ὅτε Πύθια, ὁ δὲ Κορίνθιος ὅτε Ἴσθμια, ἴτε φασὶν, ἐς τὸ στάδιον, καὶ γίνεσθε ἄνδρες οἰοικᾶν. Ἥλείοι δὲ, ἐπειδὴν ἴωσιν ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν, διαλέγονται πρὸς τοὺς ἀθλητὰς

<sup>19</sup> Cf. i. 834 6. 4. 5. Herodotus sive Aëtion: cf. also Opp. ii. 490. Pro Imaginibus 11: Pausanias, vi. xxiii. 2: iii. 353. 86. De Morte Peregrini, 3: Phi-

lostratus, Vita Apollon. vi. v. 268 D: Icones, i. 787 C. Ἀρχίων: Dio, lxxiii. 14: cf. Sueton. Nero, xxiv. 4-6.

<sup>1</sup> Ad v. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Vita Apollon. v. xv. 255 C.

<sup>3</sup> v. 11. 154: v. 10. 184.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pausanias, vi. xxi. 2: xxiii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> v. xxiv. 2.

Now forasmuch as these Hellanodikæ certainly entered on the discharge of their duties, and the athletes certainly entered the lists, and the games were certainly celebrated, at or about midsummer; this preparatory training of both, for *ten months* without interruption, must have begun at or about the autumnal equinox. In other words, if the Olympia were celebrated in Hecatombæon, the Hellanodikæ must have begun to learn the duties of their office in Boëdromion: and their office being quadriennial—this will imply that their first official year began in Boëdromion—and consequently that the civil year of the Eleans, if not the Olympic, of which this state of the case held good, must have begun in Boëdromion. If so, before that could have been the case, the beginning of the year must have been transferred from the winter solstice to the autumnal equinox. And no doubt at the expiration of the first period of the old Octaëteris, B. C. 432—by which means the ninth month in the old Octaëteric calendar, (the month which corresponded to Boëdromion,) becoming the first, the Olympic month, corresponding to Hecatombæon, before the seventh, would become the eleventh, and the stated number of months, in the civil year, between the first and the Olympic month, would always be the same as the number in the Attic calendar, between Boëdromion inclusive, and Hecatombæon exclusive—i. e. ten.

SECTION VI.—*On the names and order of the months in the Calendar of Elis.*

With respect to the names and order of the months in the calendar of Elis, Pausanias mentions a fact, which if he had

ᾧδε· Εἰ πεπόνηται ὑμῖν ἐπαξίως τοῦ ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν ἐλθεῖν, καὶ μηδὲν ῥάθυμον μηδὲ ἀγεννὲς εἴργασθε, ἵτε θαρροῦντες. οἷς δὲ μὴ ᾧδε ἡσκηται χωρεῖτε οἱ βούλεσθε <sup>5</sup>.

Compare with this the following from Clemens Alexandrinus also <sup>6</sup>:  
'Ἀθλητῆς τις οὐκ ἀγεννῆς ἐν τοῖς πύλαι πολλῶ τῷ χρόνῳ τὸ σωματίον εἰ μάλιστα πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἀσκήσας, εἰς Ὀλύμπι' ἀναβὰς εἰς τοῦ Πισταίου Διὸς τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀποβλέψας· Εἰ πάντα, εἶπεν, ᾧ Ζεῦ δεόντως μοι τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἀγῶνα παρεσκεύασται, ἀπόδος φέρων δικαίως τὴν νίκην ἐμοί.

The Hellanodikæ had power to impose fines, or other punishments, on all who were guilty of a breach of their rules, and often did so <sup>7</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. vi. iv. 265 D.

<sup>6</sup> Strom. vii. vii. § 48. 242. l. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Pausanias, v. xxi. 2, &c.

explained it a little more circumstantially might have reflected great light on this point; viz. that there was a stated sacrifice at Elis, on each of a certain number of altars enumerated by him<sup>b</sup>, *once* in every month: 'Εκάστου δὲ ἅπαξ τοῦ μηνὸς θύουσιν ἐπὶ πάντων Ἡλείου τῶν κατειλεγμένων βωμῶν... μέλει δὲ τὰ ἐς θυσίας θεηκολότῳ, ὃς ἐπὶ μηνὶ ἐκάστῳ τὴν τιμὴν ἔχει<sup>c</sup>. As it is, nothing has yet been discovered to illustrate it, except in four instances.

i. The name of some month, as we saw, occurred in the extract from the Scholia on Pindar<sup>d</sup>, but in a corrupt state. Mr. B. restores it by reading *Διόςθνος*; and at first sight that seems to be confirmed by the occurrence of a month so called, in two other calendars at least—the calendar of Thera<sup>e</sup>, and the calendar of Rhodes<sup>f</sup>. To this we may add the following from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, which appears to recognise it also: *Διόσκορος*.... Δεῖ σημειώσασθαι τὸ *Διόςθνος* παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ· ἐν συνθέσει γὰρ ὧν ἐφύλαξε τὸ σ. ἔστι δὲ ὄνομα μηνός. The meaning of this observation is that, while this was the name of a month, Callimachus read it *Διόςθνος* (or rather *Δυόςθνος*)—though analogy would have required *Διόθνος* or *Δυόθνος*\*. We may infer then from the authority of Callimachus that there was a name, known to be that of a month, in the form of *Δυόςθνος*, as much as in that of *Διόςθνος*. And as the original passage in which he mentioned this month has not come down to us, and the *Etymologicum* is not free from corruptions of readings at present, we are at liberty to conjecture that possibly the actual form of the name, according to Callimachus, was *Δυόςθνος*, not *Διόςθνος*. The meaning of such a compound term as *Διόςθνος*, denoting the sacrifice of Zeus, would be intelligible, and has been ex-

\* The *σ* however was retained in Greek in many other compound words. Hesychius has *Διοσδότους*, not *Διοδότους*: and *Θεόςδοτος*, not *Θεόδοτος*: and Tzetzes, ad Lyc. 47, *ταυροσφάγον λέαναν*, instances in *Θεόςδαρος*, instead of *Θεόδωρος*.

It is here to be observed, that though the editors of the *Etym. M.*, beginning with Sylburgius, have written this name *Διόςθνος*, the original reading, professing to be that of Callimachus too, is *Δυόςθνος*. The word most probably occurred as the name of a month in his *Μηνῶν προσηγορίαι* κ', τ. λ.; of which see vol. i. 92.

<sup>b</sup> v. xv. 6. 3-5.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. 6.

<sup>d</sup> Supra, 579.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. ii. 670.

<sup>f</sup> Supra, page 215.

plained by us<sup>g</sup>; but such a compound name as *Δυόσθνος*, both in point of etymon, and in point of meaning, is little better than unintelligible. Supposing however the form of the name to have been really *Δυόσδνος*—and assuming also, as we are at liberty to do, that this was the actual name of the Elean month alluded to in the commentary of the Scholiast on Pindar, and corrected by Mr. B. into *Διόςθνος*—then the meaning of this name may be explained by the position of the month so called in the calendar itself.

The site of this month, as defined by the author in question, was the winter solstice: from which it follows, that it corresponded in its own calendar to Posideon in the Attic; and that, whatsoever its order in the Olympic calendar, it must have been the last in the civil calendar at Elis, just as Posideon was in that at Athens. If so, it must have been at stated times the intercalary month in its proper calendar, as Posideon was in the Attic; and in the intercalary years there would be a second month of this name in the Elean calendar, as there was a second Posideon in the Attic. We conjecture therefore that it derived its name from this circumstance; and was purposely called *Δυόσδνος*—to intimate that it was the same month, only repeated—just as in Latin it might have been called Bis-Bis; as Festus<sup>h</sup> has Em-Em, for eundem. As to the form itself—*δύος* instead of *δύο*—there is no difficulty in that. *Δύος* might be the archaic form of *Δύο* itself—or it might have here the sense of the ordinal *δέυτερος*, instead of the cardinal *δύο*—or the entire name might be simply a modification of *δυό-δνο*, with the sigma inserted for the sake of lengthening the second syllable, and the termination changed into *ος*.

The meaning of the name however, in any case, would be simply that of the *double month*—the month which in the common years of the cycle was a month of 30 days, and in the intercalary years became a month of 60 days: for the peculiarity of this name, and in its proper calendar, appears to have consisted in *this*, that while it was the name of the twelfth month, in every year of the cycle alike, it was the name of a month of 60 days in the intercalary years of the

<sup>g</sup> Supra, page 218.

<sup>h</sup> v. 128. 11.



cycle, as if of the twelfth and the thirteenth both in one. It was always the name of the month which coincided with the winter solstice. This month in the Attic calendar in common years was the first Posideon, in the intercalary years was the second; in this Elean calendar, by virtue of the peculiar arrangement, whereby the same name was made to cover at one time a month of thirty days, and at another one of sixty, it was uniformly this month *Δυόσδνος*.

ii. Pausanias has twice alluded to a month in the calendar of Elis which he calls *Ἐλάφιος*: i.<sup>1</sup> *Θύεται δὲ τῷ Διὶ καὶ ἄνευ τῆς πανηγύρεως ὑπὸ τε ἰδιωτῶν, καὶ ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ὑπὸ Ἱηλείων. κατ' ἔτος δὲ ἕκαστον φυλάξαντες οἱ μάντιες τὴν ἐνάτην ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Ἐλαφίου μηνὸς κομίζουσιν ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου τὴν τέφραν, φνύσαντες δὲ τῷ ὕδατι τοῦ Ἀλφειοῦ κοινῶσιν οὕτω τὸν βωμόν* <sup>k</sup>—  
ii.<sup>1</sup> *Τὸ δὲ ὄρος τὸ Κρόνιον, κατὰ τὰ ἡδὴ λελεγμένα μοι, παρὰ τὴν κρηπίδα καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτῇ παρήκει θησαυρούς. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ὄρους τῆ κορυφῇ θύουσιν οἱ Βασίλαι καλούμενοι τῷ Κρόνῳ κατὰ ἰσημερίαν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἡρι, Ἐλαφίῳ μηνὶ παρὰ Ἱηλείοις.* The vernal equinox therefore usually fell out in this month; from which fact, and from the name, (so nearly akin to that of *Ἐλαφηβολιδών*,) we may infer that it corresponded in its own calendar to *Elaphebolion* in the Attic. The earliest limit of *Elaphebolion* in the calendar of Solen was Feb. 25, the latest March 23; and neither was materially different in the Metonic calendar also. The mean vernal equinox, both at first, and long after the Metonic correction, must have fallen out regularly in the Elean *Elaphius*, and in the Attic *Elaphebolion*—though in the time of Pausanias it was liable to fall in the month before them. As to the name, we consider the explanation of the name of *Ἐλαφηβολιδών*, which we gave on a former occasion <sup>m</sup>, to be just as applicable to that of *Ἐλάφιος*—the etymon of this name too being ultimately *ἐλαφος*, like that of *Ἐλαφηβολιδών*.

iii. iv. The names of two more months are preserved in the Scholia on Pindar <sup>n</sup>; *Γίνεται δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἐννέα μηνῶν, ποτὲ δὲ διὰ πεντήκοντα. ὄθεν καὶ, as they proceed to observe, ποτὲ μὲν τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ μηνὶ ποτὲ δὲ τῷ Παρθενίῳ....ἐπιτελεῖται.* The proper Olympic months there-

<sup>i</sup> v. xiii. 5.

<sup>k</sup> Cf. xv. 6.

<sup>l</sup> vi. xx. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Vol. i. 101.

<sup>n</sup> *Supra*, page 503. 574. Ol. iii. 35.

fore in the Olympic calendar of this time were *two*, Apollonius and Parthenius. If so, the calendar was Metonic, in which only that was possible. And the same two months in the Attic calendar being Hecatombæon and Skirrhophorion, those two Elean months must have corresponded to these two Attic months, in general; and that being the case, there cannot be much doubt that Apollonius must have answered to Hecatombæon, and Parthenius to Skirrhophorion—the former denoting Apollo's month in the Olympic calendar, as Hecatombæon did the month of the sun in the Attic<sup>o</sup>; the latter denoting the month of 'the Virgin,' that is, of Artemis—*ἡ παρθένος κατ' ἐξοχήν*.

It follows that Parthenius must have been the sixth month in the octaëteric calendar of the Eleans, and Apollonius the seventh; and that the proper seat of the former in the natural year was a certain time before midsummer, that of the latter a certain time after it: both which things were equally true of Skirrhophorion and Hecatombæon respectively. It is further observable that, according to the language of the old Scholiast literally understood, when there were 49 months complete between two Olympic cycles, the Olympic month was Apollonius, when there were 50, it was Parthenius: and this being equally true of Hecatombæon in the former case, and of Skirrhophorion in the latter, we must infer from this coincidence that the intercalary rule in the Olympic calendar, to which this state of the case was applicable, must have been the same with that in the Metonic calendar of the Athenians also.

SECTION VII.—*On the probable date of the adoption of the Metonic Correction for the regulation of the Olympic Games; and on the Olympic Terms in that Correction.*

If the tradition, relating to the origin of the name of the Golden Numbers for the different years of the Metonic cycle<sup>p</sup>, could be received as true, the Metonic correction must have been adopted at Elis, and applied to the regulation of the Olympic games, from the date of its publication, and certainly before it had yet been adopted at Athens. And though

<sup>o</sup> See vol. i. page 111.

<sup>p</sup> Vol. i. 438.

we cannot vouch for the truth of that tradition, there is no reason why we should not consider it highly probable that Meton's cycle, which was made public at Athens before the first of Hecatombæon, July 16, B. C. 432, might have been known of at Olympia, and actually set up there, as it is said to have been<sup>9</sup>, against the arrival of the lxxxviith Olympiad, which coincided with the first year of the first Metonic cycle, B. C. 432, as the xlviiith had done with the first of the first Octaëteric cycle, B. C. 592.

According to the old rule of the Olympic calendar, the numenia of the Olympic month having now advanced as far as August 15, the Olympic feriæ would have been beginning August 25 and ending August 30. But there can be little doubt that just at this particular time, (the end of the first Period of 160 years,) the Olympic dates, even for no other purpose than that of readjusting them against the decursus of another Period, must have been revised and brought back to their first principles; and at the beginning of this second Period, Olymp. lxxxvii. 1, would be the same as at the beginning of the first, Olymp. xlvii. 1—either June 25–30 or July 25–30, B. C. 432.

Let it be assumed however that instead of continuing their old octaëteris for another Period of 160 years, the Eleans determined to adopt the Metonic correction; and let it be considered what change, in the Olympic rule and in the Olympic feriæ, in that case would be requisite; and what change, from the evidence of the fact, and the circumstances of the Olympia which are still upon record from this time forward, would seem to have been actually made in both.

The date of the summer solstice in the Parapegma of Meton being assumed as a fixed and invariable term, and substituted for the traditionary date of the same kind, the first of the *Mensis Cronius* of Pelops, June 25, the rule prescribed for the regulation of the Olympic feriæ from this time forward appears to have been the following: viz. That the last of these feriæ, the day of the Κρίσις, of the Βωμῶν ἀγιστεία, and of the Κῶμος of the victors, the sixteenth of the moon, should never be allowed to fall earlier than June 27; but might fall upon it, or, within the limits of one lunar month, after it.

<sup>9</sup> Supra, vol. i. 44c.

On this principle the earliest date of these six feriæ would be June 22, and the latest July 22. The last of them might fall as early as June 27, or as late as July 27; but not before the former, nor after the latter. And these being the earliest and the latest limits of the sixteenth of the Olympic moon, respectively, those of the Olympic numeniæ would be June 12 and July 12 respectively. If the new moon fell on the 12th of June\*, the games might be celebrated June 22–27, and the Olympic month, it is evident, would be Skirrphorion or Parthenius. If earlier than June 12, they would be deferred till the next moon, July 12—the 12th of Apollonius or Hecatombæon.

Such appears to have been the rule which regulated the Olympic feriæ in the Metonic correction at Olympia, from the time when it was adopted there †. As to the year of its adoption; all we can say with confidence is that it could not have been earlier than Olymp. lxxxvii. 1, B. C. 432, though it might have been as early; but we incline to the opinion that, as the Octaëteric correction on the former occasion did not appear to have been adopted B. C. 592, Olymp. xlvii. 1, but four years later, B. C. 588, Olymp. xlvi. 1, so the Metonic correction was adopted on this occasion, four years after B. C. 432—Olymp. lxxxix. 1, B. C. 428, possibly and probably because that was also the date of the expiration of the first Period of 160 years, proper to such an epoch as B. C. 588.

\* There was however only one year in the Metonic cycle in which this would be the case; the 52nd of the Period of 76 years, the 14th of the third cycle of 19 years: and even then, the 6th of Skirrphorion being exemptile, though the first of the moon might fall on June 12, the 11th would fall on June 21, a day too early for the earliest limit, June 22. So that even in this year, the 11th of the next moon, July 21, would probably be taken in its stead.

† It is manifest that a rule like the above came much nearer to the original rule of Pelops than that which had been observed in the Octaëteric cycle; and in fact, *mutatis mutandis*, was almost the same with the Cronian rule from the first. The limits of the Olympic feriæ, prescribed by this rule, differed only per accidens from those of the *mensis Cronius*, June 25–30: and in some years of the Period of 76 years were nearly coincident with them, as in the 16th (June 29–July 4), the 60th (June 24–29), the 76th (June 27–July 2), and in one particularly, the 68th, they were actually the same, (June 25–30.)

SECTION VIII.—*On the Civil Calendar of Elis, as distinct from the Olympic.*

Though there was no reason *a priori* why the civil calendar of the Eleans themselves should have been anything different from that which was intended to regulate the games; yet such a distinction was possible, and for some reason or other it must have been considered necessary. We have seen that, in the Olympic Octaëteric correction, the first month was Dyosdyos, and the Olympic month was the eighth—and yet Dyosdyos was the last month in the civil Octaëteric calendar, and the Olympic month was the seventh. This must be decisive that the civil octaëteris at Elis was one thing, and the Olympic one was another; though the difference between them affected nothing essential, and both were the same with the Attic—the civil octaëteris absolutely so in all but the names of its months, the Olympic only accidentally different from it. In like manner, it has been seen, that while the Olympian Metonic calendar, like the Attic, began at midsummer, the civil began at the autumnal equinox, and the first month of the former was the eleventh of the latter.

The civil calendar then at Elis, from the time of the adoption of the Metonic correction, would differ from the Olympic probably to the same extent for which it differed from the Attic, except in the names of the months, which were no doubt the same in both; and it would differ from the Attic, i. by beginning in the month Boëdromion instead of the month Hecatombæon; and, ii. in all probability by assuming as its epoch the first of Boëdromion, Cycle i. 1, of the Metonic correction, Sept. 13 instead of Sept. 14. For the first two months in the Metonic cycle being both *pleni*, the date of the third *per accidens* would be one day higher than the truth required it to be; and in assuming the epoch of their Metonic correction the Eleans would probably allow for that distinction. In this case, the first month in the Elean Metonic calendar, in the first year of the cycle, would anticipate one day on the third in the Attic, in the same year, Sept. 13 instead of Sept. 14—but the second in the former would agree with the fourth in the latter, beginning

in both alike on October 13. A difference too in the beginning of the cycle, though otherwise the same in each, would entail a difference in the exemptile days in each, which, under such circumstances, could not be the same, though they would be in a determinate ratio to each other. The first exemptile day in the Elean cycle in terms of the Attic calendar would be the third of Mæmacterion; the first exemptile day in the Attic would be the third of Boëdromion, and the second the sixth of Mæmacterion. The exemptile days in the Elean cycle consequently would always be *three* days lower than those in the Attic, and the exemptile days in the Attic three days higher than those in the Elean. When the Attic was 3, for instance, the Elean would be 0—i. e. the month would be *plenus*—when the Attic was 6, the Elean would be 3—when the former was 9, the latter would be 6—and so on.

We shall conclude this part of our subject, by exhibiting the scheme of the Elean calendar, in comparison with the Attic, both the Octaëteric or Type i, and the Metonic or Type ii, of each.

*Scheme of the Elean Calendar, both the Octaëteric and the Metonic,  
in juxtaposition with the Attic.*

TYPE I.			TYPE I.		
Elean.		Octaëteric.	Attic.		
i	Unknown	29	January	19 mid.	i Γαμηλιών 29
ii	—	30	February	17 —	ii Ἀνθεστηριών 30
iii	Ἐλάφιος	29	March	19 —	iii Ἐλαφηβολιῶν 29
iv	Unknown	30	April	17 —	iv Μουνυχιῶν 30
v	—	29	May	17 —	v Θαργηλιῶν 29
vi	Παρθένιος	30	June	15 —	vi Σκιρροφοριῶν 30
vii	Ἀπολλώνιος	29	July	15 —	vii Ἑκατομβαιῶν 29
viii	Unknown	30	August	13 —	viii Μεταγειτριῶν 30
ix	—	29	September	12 —	ix Βοηδρομιῶν 29
x	—	30	October	11 —	x Πυανεψιῶν 30
xi	—	29	November	10 —	xi Μαίμακτηριῶν 29
xii	Δυόσδυος A	30	December	9 —	xii Ποσειδεῶν A 30
xiii	Δυόσδυος B	30	—	—	xiii Ποσειδεῶν B 30

TYPE II.		TYPE II.	
Elean.		Metonic *.	Attic.
i	Unknown		iii Βοηδρομιῶν
ii	—		iv Πυανεψιῶν
iii	—		v Μαίμακτηριῶν
iv	Δυόσδυος A Δυόσδυος B		vi Ποσειδεῶν A Ποσειδεῶν B
v	Unknown		vii Γαμηλιῶν
vi	—		viii Ἀνθεστηριῶν
vii	Ἐλάφιος		ix Ἐλαφηβολιῶν
viii	Unknown		x Μουνυχιῶν
ix	—		xi Θαργηλιῶν
x	Παρθένιος		xii Σκιρροφοριῶν
xi	Ἀπολλώνιος		i Ἑκατομβαιῶν
xii	Unknown		ii Μεταγειτριῶν

\* See vol. vi. Appendix, Table iii. the first Callippic period of this Metonic calendar in annis expansis.

## CHAPTER IV.

*On the Verification of the Olympic Calendar of the Origines  
Kalendariæ Hellenicæ.*

## SECTION I.

i. Olympiad lxxxviii. Period i. 5. Cycle i. 5. B. C. 428.

Olympic feriæ, Apollonius }  
Hecatombæon } 11—16. July 12—17.

The truth of the Olympic calendar, which we have compiled for the first period of the octaëteric correction, B. C. 592—B. C. 432, may be considered sufficiently confirmed both by the general proofs of the Olympic rule, while the calendar was still octaëteric, which we have already laid before the reader, and by the particular testimony of Olymp. lvii. B. C. 552, and Olymp. lxxv. B. C. 480. It remains to adduce some proofs of its correctness for the remainder of the interval over which it extends, when the calendar was now Metonic.

To consider indeed every Olympic year, which happens to be noticed in history, after B. C. 432, and to examine minutely such of its circumstances as are on record, would be an endless task; though the result, in repeated instances, would be a striking confirmation of our Olympic Fasti. The truth however of a rule, which by hypothesis was always the same, may be tested by a few examples, as well as by many. We shall therefore confine ourselves to one or two instances, which are probably as critical as any which could be selected, and as standing at the greatest distance of time from one another, are so much the better adapted for our purpose—i. e. the proof of the celebration of the Olympic games, as low down as they can be traced historically, according to one and the same rule, and that rule altogether the same as that of our own Olympic Fasti.

The first of these instances is that of Olympiad lxxxviii. B. C. 428, mentioned by Thucydides in the fourth year of



the Peloponnesian war<sup>r</sup>. The most remarkable circumstance about this was the following: That immediately after the games, before all who had been present had left Olympia, when the Mytilenian ambassadors had their audience of the Lacedæmonians, and the invasion of Attica a second time that year was under consideration, while this, we say, was going on between the Lacedæmonians and these ambassadors just after the games, the rest of the allies of the Lacedæmonians were engaged on their harvest, and had neither leisure, nor inclination, to take the field again at that juncture of time in particular. The harvest alluded to in this instance, to judge from the language of Thucydides, must have been the harvest ἀπλωσ, i. e. wheat harvest. Now the date of barley harvest, for the climate of the Peloponnese, being the eighth month from the seed month, November, i. e. June, and that of wheat harvest being the ninth, i. e. July<sup>s</sup>, if this deliberation at Olympia was going on in the midst of wheat harvest, it must have been going on at the middle of July; and if the games were only just over at that time, the games must have coincided with the middle of July too.

This is shewn by our Olympic calendar, Olympiad lxxxviii. 1. to have actually been the case. The Olympic feriæ that year in the Olympic calendar fell Apollonius 11—16, in the Attic, Hecatombæon 11—16, in the Julian, July 12—17, B. C. 428; at which time wheat harvest in the Peloponnese must have been actively going on.

This Olympiad, as we have already seen reason to conclude<sup>t</sup>, is remarkable, as probably that which the Eleans first observed in conformity to the rule of the games in the Metonic cycle.

ii. Olympiad cvi. Period i. 76. Cycle iv. 19. B. C. 356.

Olympic feriæ, Parthenius } 11—16. June 27—July 2.  
Skirrhophorion }

The date of the birth of Alexander the Great, in the Macedonian calendar, was Louis 6, and Louis 6, in the year of his

<sup>r</sup> ii. 105. iii. 1—8.

<sup>s</sup> See i. vol. i. 164.

<sup>t</sup> Page 596.

birth, B. C. 356, coincided with July 1<sup>v</sup>, and July 1, B. C. 356, as our Olympic calendar shews, coincided with the fifth of the Olympic feriæ, the last day of the games as such, Olymp. cvi. The tradition of history is that Alexander was born at Pella the same day on which Philip his father heard of his victory in the chariot race at Olympia; and we considered the truth of this tradition in illustration of the Macedonian calendar of the time being, and found it altogether agreeable to the matter of fact<sup>x</sup>. On this principle, the fifth of the Olympic feriæ, Olymp. cvi. 1. and the 6th of Louis, in the Macedonian Octaëteric Calendar, cycle xiv. 8, coincided together; and the date of the latter having been July 1, B. C. 356, that of the former must have been so too: which is as exact a confirmation of our Olympic Fasti for this particular Olympiad as can be desired.

iii. Olymp. clxxxiv. Period vi. 8. Cycle xxi. 8. B. C. 44.

Olympic feriæ, Parthenius }  
Skirrhophorion } 11—16. July 3—8.

To illustrate the truth of our Olympic Fasti for this Olympiad, which coincided with the year of the death of Julius Cæsar, we must have recourse to the epistles of Cicero; and shall be obliged to enter upon the consideration of *his* movements from the death of Cæsar to the date of his return to Rome, and of the delivery of his first Philippic in the senate at Rome, on the second of September (Roman) the same year<sup>y</sup>.

The troubles excited by the death of Cæsar, soon after the Ides of March, appear to have determined Cicero at first to retire for a time to Greece, where his son Marcus was studying at Athens, under Cratippus<sup>z</sup>; and he took the first step towards the execution of this intention by leaving Rome early in the month of April. There is a series of letters, partly to Atticus<sup>a</sup>, partly to others of his friends, by means

<sup>v</sup> See vol. iii. 11.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. 24.

<sup>y</sup> Vide ad Fam. xii. 2. cf. Philipp. i. capp. 3, 7—6, 14. v. 7, 19, 20.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Philipp. i. 1. 2. 6. 3, 7—8 sqq. De Officiis, i. 1: Ad Attic. xv. 15.

<sup>a</sup> Ad Attic. xiv. 5. dated Astura iii. Id. (as the context requires) Apriles. cf. xiv. 6, 7, 8: 12, 13, 14, (cf. 19.) 15. (where the Kalends of May are first mentioned) down to xvi. 7. dated xiv. Kal. Sept. the same year.

of which his proceedings might be traced from the time of his departure to the time of his return. But we propose to confine ourselves at present to such notices as concern the contemplated visit to Greece, and require to be taken into account in illustration of that project.

Now, in a letter to Atticus<sup>b</sup>, dated xvii kal. Mai., though he had already left Rome, he speaks of not visiting Greece before the month Quinctilis, i. e. July: *Si ergo est, volo mense Quinctili in Græciam*: and he alludes again to this visit in a letter of the v Nones of May<sup>c</sup>: *Cupio cum Bruto nostro affatim satisfecerim excurrere in Græciam*: which shews that he was still retaining his intention nineteen days after the former allusion to it.

The plan which he had formed at first, was that of going by way of Brundisium<sup>d</sup>; and he took his leave of Atticus as if on the eve of setting out in that direction, sometime not long before the vi Nonas Julias<sup>e</sup>. He changed his mind however about the route, for prudential reasons; and determined to take the safer, though more circuitous road, through Syracuse<sup>f</sup>, in the hope too of availing himself of the Etesian winds<sup>g</sup>. But these winds failed to set in, time enough for his purpose. When he was at Vibo with his friend Sica, ix kal. Sextiles, he complains *Prodromi nulli*<sup>h</sup>: and though the sequel of this history of his journey, in his Epistles, from this point of time is lost, we collect from the first Philippic<sup>i</sup>, compared with subsequent letters<sup>k</sup>, that he was at Syracuse on the Kalends of Sextilis (August), and at Leucopetra, a promontory of Rhegium, on the viii Id. of that month, on his way to Greece from Sicily; and having been driven back to Leucopetra again by a wind from the south, was finally at Velia, in company with Brutus, on the xvi. Kal. Septembres<sup>l</sup>; and he subsequently alludes to the circumstance of his having been thus prevented from continuing

<sup>b</sup> xiv. 7.

<sup>c</sup> xiv. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Cf. ad Attic. xv. 21: the date of which was circa xi Kalendas (Quinctiles or Julias).

<sup>e</sup> Ad Attic. xv. 27. cf. 26, 28, 29: all written between vi Non. and iv Non. Quinctiles or Julias: xvi. 1: dated Postridie Nonas Quinctiles: xvi. 2, on vi Id. (Quinctiles): xvi. 3,

which xvi. 4 shews should come next to xvi. 2.

<sup>f</sup> Philipp. i. 3, 7.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. ad Attic. xvi. 4, dated viii Id. (Quinctiles).

<sup>h</sup> ad Attic. xvi. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Cap. I. 3, 7.

<sup>k</sup> Ad Attic. xvi. 7.

<sup>l</sup> Cf. ad Attic. xvi. 7. on the xiv. Kal. Sept. two days later.

his journey to Greece, after he had actually set out upon it, as something remarkable, and even providential<sup>m</sup>. For example, when writing to Cornificius, B. C. 43<sup>n</sup>: Ego tuorum consiliorum auctor dignitatisque fautor, iratus temporibus in Græciam, desperata libertate, rapiebar: cum me etesiæ, quasi boni cives, relinquentem rempublicam prosequi noluerunt, austerque adversus maximo flatu me ad tribules tuos Rheginos retulit: atque inde ventis remis in patriam omni festinatione properavi, postridieque in summa reliquorum servitute liber unus fui. And again, in a letter to Brutus<sup>o</sup>: Itaque in medio Achaico cursu, cum Etesiarum diebus Auster me in Italiam, quasi dissuasor mei consilii, retulisset, te vidi Velia<sup>p</sup>, doluique vehementer.

It thus appears that it was his intention at first to go to Greece in the month Quinctilis, and *early* in that month; though, having been delayed by circumstances, he did not actually set out until near the end of the month. Now the Ludi Apollinares fell out in this month at Rome, and as this exhibition was part of the duties of the prætor, Brutus, who was serving the office of prætor this year, had to exhibit them.

The first allusion to these games of Brutus' occurs in a letter to Atticus<sup>q</sup>, dated vi. Kal. of some month, which we apprehend to have been Junius, so that the date was May 27 Roman<sup>r</sup>, after a meeting with Brutus at Antium: Constituit igitur, ut ludi, absente se, fierent suo nomine: proficisci autem mihi in Asiam videbatur ab Antio velle. They are mentioned again in the next letter<sup>s</sup>, which is without a date: Noster vero...in Asiam...ludos enim absens facere malebat: statim autem se iturum simul ac ludorum apparatus iis qui curaturi essent tradidisset—though he did not set out in this direction until long after the stated time of these Ludi, having been still in Italy as late as the xvi. Kal. Sept.<sup>t</sup>, and even as the middle of September.

<sup>m</sup> Cf. ad Fam. xii. 25: also vii. 19. Trebatio, dated v. Kal. Sext. Rhegio: and vii. 20. xiii. Kal. Sext. from Velia (on his way to Sicily at that time no doubt) as appears also from the *Topica ad Trebatium*, 1. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Ad Fam. xii. 25.

<sup>o</sup> Ad Brutum, 15.

<sup>p</sup> Cf. ad Attic. xvi. 7.

<sup>q</sup> xv. 11.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. xv. 13. and xv. 18.

<sup>s</sup> xv. 12.

<sup>t</sup> Ad Attic. xvi. 7.

It appears further<sup>v</sup>, that in the edict of Brutus these games had been announced for the nones of *July* instead of *Quinctilis*, recognising thereby the new name of the month, which had been recently given it in honour of Julius Cæsar<sup>x</sup>; and though this was merely an oversight<sup>y</sup>, it gave Brutus considerable mortification, as soon as he was aware of it: Ita ut heri tibi narravi, vel fortasse hodie .in Nesida \* viii. Idus. ibi Brutus. quam ille doluit de Nonis Juliis! mirifice est conturbatus. itaque sese scripturum aiebat ut venationem etiam, quæ postridie ludos Apollinares futura est, proseriberent iii. Id. Quinctiles. The end of the games is hereby implied to have been iv. Id. Quinctiles; and though in the edict, alluded to supra, they appear to have been dated on the *nones*. that might mean that they were announced for pridie nonas. Their calendar date at least was from pridie nonas to iii. Idus Quinctiles or Julias, both inclusive<sup>z</sup>.

Now there is a letter to Atticus<sup>a</sup>, dated vi. Non. Julias, (July 2, Roman) ex Arpinati, in which he speaks of having heard from Brutus, Pridie Kalendas, (June 30, Roman) requesting him to be present at these games; a request which he considered on many accounts illtimed and unbecoming, and therefore positively declined: Rescripsi scilicet primum me jam profectum, ut non integrum sit: deinde ἀτοπώτατον esse me, qui Romam omnino post hæc arma non accesserim. neque id tam periculi mei causa fecerim quam dignitatis, subito ad ludos venire. tali enim tempore ludos facere illi honestum est cui necesse est: spectare mihi ut non est necesse sic ne honestum quidem est.

Yet notwithstanding this, when his intention of going to Greece in the month Quinctilis had come to be generally known, a report *had* been circulated that his motive in going there was to see the Olympic games. We learn this from the account of what passed between Cicero and Brutus, when

\* Of this Nesis (in Campania,) confer Pliny, II. N. xix. 42. 428: and of this meeting of Cicero with Brutus there, Philipp. x. 4, 8.

<sup>v</sup> Ad Attic. xvi. 4. dated viii. Idus Quinctiles: cf. I, 2: also Plutarch, Brutus, xxi.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. our Origines Kalendariæ Ital. iv. 21. and note.

<sup>y</sup> Ad. Attic. xvi. 4. cf. xvi. 1.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. in reference to these Ludi of Brutus, ad Attic. xv. 28, 29: Philipp. i. 15, 36: ii. 13, 31: x. 3, 7, 4, 8: Dio, xlvii. 20: Plutarch, Brutus, xxi.

<sup>a</sup> xv. 26.

they met at Velia, after the former had been compelled by the weather to put back to Rhegium. Nam xvi. Kal. Sept. cum venissem Veliam, Brutus audivit. erat enim cum suis navibus apud Haletem fluvium, citra Veliam millia passuum iii. pedibus ad me statim<sup>b</sup>. Dii immortales, quam valde ille reditu vel potius reversione mea lætatus, effudit illa omnia quæ tacuerat...se autem lætari quod effugissem duas maximas vituperationes, unam quam itinere faciendo me intelligebam suscipere, desperationis ac relictionis reipublicæ...alteram, de qua Brutus et qui una erant, (multi autem erant,) lætabantur, quod eam vituperationem effugissem, me existimari ad Olympia (scil. profectum.) On which he subjoins: Hoc vero nihil turpius quovis reipublicæ tempore; sed hoc ἀναπολόγητον. ego vero Austro gratias miras, qui me a tanta infamia averterit.

Now though this construction of the motive of his journey was false, there must have been some apparent foundation for it, and that would be supplied by the fact that, at the time when he was going to Greece, the Olympia were close at hand. It may be inferred too from the above account of these proceedings, that these games in Greece, and the Ludi Apollinares at Rome, must have been very nearly coincident; and that Cicero had probably offended Brutus by declining to be present at the latter, because it was unbecoming the time and his own character, and yet being supposed to have been going to Greece on purpose to see the former.

Now by our Olympic Fasti the stated date of Olymp. clxxxiv. would be Parthenius 11-16, July 3-8, B. C. 44, only one day earlier in their commencement than the Ludi Apollinares the same year, July 6 Roman, July 4 Julian. They were both therefore as nearly as possible contemporaneous; and this coincidence is too critical not to confirm our Olympic calendar in a remarkable manner. We will add only that as Cicero was on his way to Greece, June 30 Roman, June 28 Julian, when he wrote to Atticus, ex Arpinati<sup>c</sup>, six days before July 4, when the games would begin, there was abundance of time for him to have got to Olympia, even after that, by the first day of the games.

<sup>b</sup> Ad Atticum, xvi. 7. Cf. ad Brutum, 10. 15: Philipp. i. 3, 7: 4, 9: x. 4. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Ad Atticum, xv. 26. supra, 605.

iv. Olympiad ccxxxvi. Period viii. 65. Cycle xxxii. 8.  
A. D. 165.

Olympic feriae, Apollonius  
Hecatombæon } 11—16. July 16—21.

This Olympiad was made memorable by the death of the Cynic philosopher Peregrinus, or Proteus, who burnt himself publicly at it. Lucian was an eyewitness of this event, and has left an account of it<sup>d</sup>; which, though written in his usual manner, for anything which appears to the contrary may be treated as authentic and trustworthy, especially with reference to those particular circumstances, which are most important for our own purpose, the illustration of the Olympic rule, such as it must have been *de facto* at this period of its history. The first thing necessary is to ascertain the date of the Olympiad.

It appears from this narrative of Lucian's, that Peregrinus announced his intention of burning himself at the Olympiad last before this<sup>e</sup>: 'Ες δὲ τὴν ἐξῆς Ὀλυμπιάδα, λόγον τινα διὰ τεττάρων ἑτῶν συνθεὶς τῶν διὰ μέσου, ἐξήνεγκε πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἔπαινον ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπαγαγόντος, καὶ ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ τῆς τότε φυγῆς. ἤδη δὲ ἀμελούμενος ὑφ' ἀπίστων...τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο τόλμημα ἐβουλεύσατο περὶ τῆς πυρᾶς, καὶ διέδωκε λόγον ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας εἰθὺς ἀπ' Ὀλυμπίων τῶν ἔμπροσθεν ὡς ἐς τοῦπιόν καύσων ἑαυτόν<sup>f</sup>.

The aqueduct here alluded to had been constructed at the expense of Herodes Atticus, for the refreshment of the spectators at the games<sup>g</sup>, and Peregrinus at first had declaimed against it, as tending to render the Greeks effeminate; but finding that of no avail to gain popularity, he was now vindicating and applauding it. The date of this work consequently could not have been later than Olymp. ccxxxv. A. D. 161, and was very probably Olymp. ccxxxiv. A. D. 157. Among those who heard Peregrinus announce at this Olym-

<sup>d</sup> De Morte Perigrini, Opp. iii. 325—364: cf. iii. 111. adversus Indoctum, 14.

<sup>e</sup> This Olympiad is mentioned by Pausanias, x. xxxiv. 2. (Olymp. ccxxxv. A. D. 161) when the victor in the stade was Mnasiubulus of Elatea. cf. the Anec-

dota Græca Par. ii. 152. 30: and Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. 311.

<sup>f</sup> Opp. loc. cit. 344. cap. 20.

<sup>g</sup> Cf. Philostratus, Vitæ Soph. ii. 550 A: 555 C: 562 B. C. and supra, 493 n.

piad the intention which he executed at the next, Lucian himself might have been one, as he tells us he was four times a spectator of the games, including those at which Peregrinus burnt himself<sup>h</sup>. The emperor reigning, just before this announcement, is represented as *πράγματος καὶ ἡμερώτατος*<sup>i</sup>, which was a very just description of the character of Antoninus Pius, whose reign was still continuing down to March 8, A. D. 161. Herodes Atticus too, though not named, is recognised as one of the contemporaries of Peregrinus<sup>k</sup>; as he certainly was, having flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, as well as in that of Antoninus Pius. Musonius, Dio (Chrysostom), and Epictetus, are also alluded to<sup>l</sup>, as philosophers, whose freedom of speech had exposed them not long before to the sentence of banishment from Rome; and these are known to have flourished in the reigns of Nero, Vespasian, and Domitian. Lastly, this self-immolation of Peregrinus, or Proteus, is dated by Jerome at this very Olympiad, cccxxvi. A. D. 165<sup>n\*</sup>, so that there can be no doubt concerning it.

\* Peregrinum illum imitatus Protea cognomine philosophum clarum, qui cum mundo digredi stauisset, Olympiæ, quinquennali certamine sub Græciæ conspectu totius, ascenso rogo quem ipse construxit flammis absumtus est<sup>1+</sup>.—De Proteo: Τοῦτον δ' οὐκ ἀγνοεῖτε ῥίψαντα ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ περὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν<sup>2</sup>—And according to Athenagoras, oracles were said to be delivered by his statue at Parium, after his death. Tertullian<sup>3</sup> alludes to his death as an instance of a voluntary one. Proteus is mentioned by A. Gellius<sup>4</sup> in terms of respect, at a time when he himself was studying at Athens as a young man, which was long before A. D. 165. Tatian also seems to allude to him as still living<sup>5</sup>; which, if true, would imply that the date of the Oratio was before A. D. 165, and also the death of Justin Martyr, referred to in it as a past event<sup>6</sup>. Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels, vol. iii. 585 sqq. Append. Diss. xiii.

<sup>h</sup> iii. 356. 35. cf. iii. 166. Pseudologista, 4. and 168. 6, 7. when Lucian was at Olympia. Also i. 743. Hermotimus, 4: 782. 39. 784. 41: ii. 393. 58. Demonax.

<sup>i</sup> iii. 342. 18.

<sup>k</sup> iii. 343. 19. 84: 344. 20. cf. ii.

<sup>1</sup> Ammianus Marc. xxix. 1. 179. cf. Philostratus, Vitæ Soph. ii. 563 B. Herodes.

<sup>2</sup> Athenagoras, Legatio, cap. 23.

384. Demonax, 21, 22.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Thesaurus Temporum, Olymp. ccxiv. 4.

<sup>n</sup> Jerome, Chron. ad Ann. 2181. No doubt after Eusebius. See Chron. Arm. Lat. ii. ad Ann. 2180. Olymp. cccxxvi.

<sup>3</sup> iv. 71. Ad Martyres 4.

<sup>4</sup> viii. 3: xii. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Oratio, xli.

<sup>6</sup> xxxi. 69. 10: xxxii. 71. 8.



Now among those who were present at this Olympiad Lucian was one<sup>o</sup>: Ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεὶ τάχιστα εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀφικόμενος διὰ τοῦ γυμνασίου αὐτῶν, ἐπήκουον ἄμα Κυριακοῦ τινοῦ, κ', τ. λ. which Cynic philosopher was one Theagenes<sup>p</sup>, a follower and admirer of Proteus. By the old Olympic rule, the games on this occasion too must have been celebrated six days; but when we consider the change of circumstances, and the decay in the estimation and splendour even of the games of the Period, which by this time had very probably taken place, it will not be surprising that in this instance, A. D. 165, they appear to have both begun and ended the same day. At least, if we follow Lucian's own account from the first mention of his arrival<sup>q</sup>, to the beginning of the games<sup>r</sup>, (ushered in by the session of the Hellanodikæ on their usual seat in the Πιθέριον \*,) and so on to the end<sup>s</sup>, it will be clear that all must have come within the limits of one day; it is impossible that the account could have been distributed over four or five †.

\* Cf. Pausanias, vi. xxiii. 2.

† It does not follow, even in this case, that the arrival of spectators at Olympia might not have been going on some time before, as it appears from the account it was<sup>1</sup>; Proteus himself, in particular, having been on the spot at least nine days before that on which he burnt himself at last<sup>2</sup>.

That the celebrity on this occasion began and ended on the same day, and Proteus' self immolation was purposely reserved for the consummation of the whole, appears not only from the rest of the context, but in particular from the allusion to the Κηρύκων ἀγών: Ἐπεὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν ἀφικόμεθα, μεστὸς ἦν ὁ ὀπισθόδομος τῶν κατηγορούντων Πρωτεύς, ἢ ἐπαυούτων τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ. . . ἄχρι δὴ παρελθὼν αὐτὸς ὁ Πρωτεύς μυρῖω τῷ πλήθει παραπεμπόμενος, κατόπιν τοῦ τῶν κηρύκων ἀγῶνος, λόγους τινας διεξήλθε περὶ αὐτοῦ κ', τ. λ.<sup>3</sup>

The Κηρύκων ἀγών did not originally make one of the contests at the Olympic games, but was added in the course of time, as well as that of the Σάλπιγκται—Καὶ ἦν ἀγώνισμα σάλπιγγος τὸ πρεσβύτερον. . . πρότερον δ' Ὀλυμπιάσι τῶν ἐπιχωρίων κηρυττόντων, οἱ ταῖς ἱερουργίαις ὑποδιηκουοῦντο, πρῶτος τῶν ξένων ἠγωνίσαστο τὰ Ὀλύμπια Ἀρχίας Ὑβλαίος, καὶ τρεῖς Ὀλυμ-

<sup>o</sup> iii. 327. 3. 34.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. 5.

<sup>q</sup> Loco citato.

<sup>r</sup> iii. 353. 31. 84: 32. 89.

<sup>s</sup> iii. 356. 35. Καὶ δὴ τὰ μὲν Ὀλύμπια τέλος εἶχε, κάλλιστα Ὀλυμπίων γενομένα ὧν ἐγὼ εἶδον, τετράκις ἤδη ὄρων.

<sup>1</sup> iii. 326. cap. 1, 11: 363. 44, 77. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 329. 5, 62.

<sup>3</sup> iii. 353. 32, 89.

The end of the whole solemnity at this time is further implied in the fact next mentioned; that owing to the dispersion of the spectators, now beginning, and the numbers hastening away at once, Lucian himself could find no means of departing that day, and was obliged, against his will, to stay until the next: 'Εγὼ δὲ, οὐ γὰρ ἦν εὐπορήσαι ὀχήματος, ἅμα πολλῶν ἐξιόντων, ἄκων ὑπελιπόμην—to which circumstance we owe it, that he was an eyewitness of the end of Peregrinus, which otherwise he could not have seen.

The sequel of the account, which relates the consummation of what had thus been contemplated for four years before, we must give in his own words<sup>t</sup>: 'Ο δὲ ἀεὶ ἀναβαλλόμενος νύκτα τὸ τελευταῖον προειρήκει ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν κούσιν καὶ με τῶν ἑταίρων τινὸς παραλαβόντος περὶ μέσας νύκτας, ἔξαναστὰς ἀπήειν

πίυδος ἐφεξῆς ἐνίκα' καὶ Πυθοὶ δὲ ἐνίκα' καὶ εἰκῶν τις ἦν αὐτοῦ Πυθική, καὶ ἐπίγραμμα<sup>4</sup>—Καὶ ἐναγώνιος καὶ τορὸν ἠχοῦσα, ὡσπερ ἡ Ὀλυμπικὴ σάλπιγξ<sup>5</sup>.

These trumpeters and heralds tried the strength of their lungs against each other, standing in the "Ἄλτις"<sup>6</sup>, (the original form of which name appears to have been "Ἄλις"<sup>7</sup>), and upon an altar erected there, used for this purpose, and no other. 'Ἐπὶ τούτου θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ θύουσιν Ἥλειοι, σαλπικταῖς δὲ ἐφεστηκόσιν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀγωνίζεσθαι καθέστηκε<sup>8</sup>. And Pausanias tells us also<sup>9</sup> there was a Στήλη in this "Ἄλτις, the distance of which from another in Sparta was 660 stades.

Now there is reason to believe the Κηρύκων ἀγὼν was the last of the contests at Olympia, and the conclusion of the solemnity. Lucian, speaking of his own Demonax<sup>10</sup>, and of the end of his life, observes, "Ὅτε δὲ συνῆκεν οὐκέθ' οἷός τε ὦν αὐτῷ ἐπικουρεῖν, εἰπὼν πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας τὸν ἐναγώνιον τῶν κηρύκων πόδα,

Δήγει μὲν ἀγῶν, τῶν καλλίστων  
ἄθλων ταμίας, καιρὸς δὲ καλεῖ  
μηκέτι μέλλειν κ', τ. λ.

after which he terminated his existence by a voluntary death. We may conclude then that this contest closed the games, and this notification of the close of the games itself, and in these words, was that which constituted the trial of the heralds itself.

<sup>t</sup> iii. 356. 35.

<sup>4</sup> Pollux, iv. xii. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Philostratus, Vitæ Soph. i. 541 B. Polemo.

<sup>6</sup> Pindar, Olymp. x = xi. 54, 55. and the Schol. in loc. Anecdota Gr. Par. ii. 146, the institution of both is dated

Olymp. 96. cf. Chron. Arm. Lat. i. 294.

<sup>7</sup> Schol. in loc.

<sup>8</sup> Pausanias, v. xxii. 1.

<sup>9</sup> vi. xvi. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Opp. ii. 395. Demonax, 65.

εὐθὺ τῆς Ἀρπίνης, ἔνθα ἦ ἡ πυρά. στάδιοι πάντες οὗτοι εἴκοσιν ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀλυμπίας, κατὰ τὸν ἱππόδρομον ἀπιόντων πρὸς ἔω. καὶ ἐπεὶ τάχιστα ἀφικόμεθα, καταλαμβάνομεν πυρὰν νεησμένην ἐν βάθει, ὅσοι ἐς ὄργυιαν τὸ βάθος. ὁᾶδες ἦσαν τὰ πολλὰ, καὶ παρεβέβυστο τῶν φρυγάνων, ὡς ἀναφθείη τάχιστα.

He proceeds<sup>v</sup>, Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ σελήνη ἀνέτειλεν, ἔδει γὰρ κἀκείνην θεάσασθαι τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦτο ἔργον\*, πρόεισιν ἐκεῖνος ἐσκευασμένος ἐς τὸν αἰὲ τρόπον, καὶ ζῆν αὐτῷ τὰ τέλη τῶν κυνῶν· καὶ μάλιστα ὁ γενιάδας ὁ ἐκ Πατρῶν (Theagenes), δᾶδα ἔχων, οὐ φαῦλος δευτεραγωνιστῆς κ', τ. λ.<sup>x</sup> Now it is here to be observed that he had to walk to this spot (two miles from Olympia), which would require half an hour at least, and that he set out, as he himself says, *περὶ μέσας νύκτας*, which may not necessarily mean at midnight, but may very reasonably be supposed to mean a time approaching to midnight, not more than an hour or an hour and an half before midnight. And as the moon was rising when he reached the spot, moon-rise that night must have been taking place an hour or upwards before midnight; and the day before having been, as we have seen, the first of the Olympic feria by the old rule, the eleventh of the month, on this principle the moon was rising an hour or upwards before midnight on the eleventh of the month.

Now with a calendar true to the moon, or in which the eleventh of the calendar month was the eleventh of the lunar also, this would have been impossible; but with such a calendar as we suppose the Olympic to have been at this time, the vulgar Metonic calendar brought down, according to one rule and one system of administration, without change or correction, from B. C. 432 to A. D. 165, it was very possible: or rather just at this time it must necessarily have been the case. The precession of the calendar Numenia on

\* This circumstance of the rising of the moon, just when Proteus was preparing to ascend the pyre, is the most important of all for our particular argument, and it is confirmed by another allusion to the death of Proteus, which Lucian puts into the mouth of Apollo, supposed to be speaking to Zeus, iii. 365. Fugitivi, 1: Ἀληθῆ ταῦτά φασι, πάτερ, ὡς ἐμβάλοι τις αὐτὸν φέρον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, κατέναντι Ὀλυμπίων, ἤδη πρεσβύτης ἄνθρωπος; . . . ἡ Σελήνη γὰρ ἡμῖν διηγείτο, αὐτὴ ἑωρακῆναι καιόμενον λέγουσα. Cf. 369. 7. 12.

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. 36. 51.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. 356, 357. 36.

the true, in the vulgar Metonic cycle, in the Callippic period amounted to one day; and A. D. 165 being the 65th year of the eighth period, the 11th of the month from that cause alone, at this time, must have been falling on the 18th or even the 19th of the moon. And when we add to this, that the Callippic period itself was liable to contract an excess of a day in 304 years, and that A. D. 165 was near the end of the second period of 304 years from B. C. 432 (the interval being 596 years), two more days of excess must be taken into account on this score also. So that from both these causes together, the 11th of the calendar, A. D. 165, instead of falling on the 11th of the moon, would be actually falling on the 21st of the moon; and the moon, 20 days old complete, would be rising an hour or two before midnight, on the eleventh of the calendar month.

This is confirmed by calculation; according to which the new moon of June A. D. 165, for the meridian of the ancient Olympia, is seen to have fallen out on the 26th of that month, five or six hours after midnight—and consequently the moon was 20 days old complete July 16, the stated date of the first of the Olympic feriæ, Olymp. cccxxvi, according to the old rule at least, continued unchanged down to this time, Apollonius 11, July 16, A. D. 165.

The moon therefore having been in conjunction with the sun so near the point of sunrise June 26 this year, would rise about the same time as the sun, on that day; and twenty days after, by mean motion, July 16, about 18 hours later; that is, about 11 P. M. And this too is confirmed by calculation: for the time of the moon's rising, for the latitude and meridian of the ancient Olympia, on this day, July 16, A. D. 165, having been expressly calculated by a very competent person, from Damoiseau's Lunar Tables, it was found that the apparent rising of the moon's centre took place about 10. 32. 26.6 P. M. that day; which is as exact a confirmation of our conclusions, as derived from the testimony of Lucian, (himself an eyewitness,) as could be desired.

This example is therefore the most critical proof of the truth of our Olympic Fasti which has yet been produced. It proves that there could have been no difference between the vulgar Metonic calendar at Athens, and the Olympic calen-

dar at Elis, from B. C. 432 down to this time, A. D. 165. It proves also that though the Callippic correction of the Metonic cycle was made known to the world B. C. 330, it could never have been applied to the vulgar Metonic cycle at Olympia, no more than at Athens; of which fact indeed, in the case of the vulgar Metonic calendar at Athens, we met with abundance of evidence in the former part of this work<sup>y</sup>—and of which the Olympiad last considered, and that in the present instance, are equally decisive in the case of the Olympic calendar.

SECTION II.—*On the final cessation of the Olympic Games; and on the Olympia of Antioch.*

It is generally assumed that the Olympic games continued to be celebrated as late as the fourth or fifth century of the Christian Æra. Cedrenus appears to date their suppression in the 16th (*potius* the 15th) of Theodosius the elder, A. D. 393<sup>z</sup>. Joannes Lydus attributes it to Theodosius the younger<sup>a</sup>: Θεοδόσιος ὁ μικρὸς νεωτερίζων τὸ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐκ τῶν χρόνων ἀπῆλειψεν ὄνομα—unless he meant the substitution of some other æra for that of the reckoning by Olympiads. The Olympic games are certainly recognised as in existence in the reign of Theodosius the Great<sup>b</sup>; and by Moses Chorensis seem to be so even as late as the 20th of Theodosius the younger<sup>c</sup>.

A singular statement is extant in Malala relating to a bequest by a certain Sosibius, a senator of Antioch, contemporary with Augustus Cæsar; who founded games at Antioch, which were called Olympic, and, in the course of time, in splendour and celebrity appear to have eclipsed the Olympic of their own day; and having been once brought into being, continued in existence down to the reign of the emperor Justin. It may not be inappropriate to the subject of which we have been treating, briefly to consider what Malala has left on record in reference to this foundation.

It appears that his account of Sosibius was taken from an author whom he calls Pausanias<sup>d</sup>. Sosibius accompanied

<sup>y</sup> Vol. ii. 58 sqq.

<sup>z</sup> Mr. Clinton, *Fasti Romani* ad A. D. 393. Ol. 293.

<sup>a</sup> iv. 64. 95. 22.

<sup>b</sup> *Anecdota Græca* Paris. ii. 155. 17.

<sup>c</sup> iii. 40. 279. <sup>d</sup> ix. 248. 15.

Augustus to Rome, on his first return from the east (after Actium, and the death of Antony and Cleopatra), B. C. 29, U. C. 725: and at Rome he died—Καταλιπὼν τὴν πρόσσοδον αὐτοῦ τῇ ἰδίᾳ πόλει εἰς τὸ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ κατὰ πενταετηρίδα τριάκοντα ἡμέρας τοῦ Ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς ἀγῶνας ἀκροαμάτων, καὶ θυμελικῶν σκηρικῶν πάντων, καὶ ἀθλητῶν, καὶ ἵππικὸν ἀγῶνα<sup>e</sup>: and the same statement occurs in the Chronicon Paschale<sup>f</sup>, only more briefly, and with the name of Peritius for Hyperberetæus—which must have been an error. This bequest could not have been earlier than B. C. 29, but it might have been made that very year; and as this year, in the Olympic æra, corresponded to Olymp. clxxxvii. 4, reckoned from midsummer, and the cycle of these Olympia at Antioch appears to have actually borne date in the fourth year of the Olympia, *ex æstate*, either B. C. 29 or B. C. 25 was very probably the year in question. At this time the calendar of Antioch was still lunar<sup>g</sup>; and the prescribed month of these Antiochene Olympia, Hyperberetæus, must be understood of the lunar month so called, which B. C. 29<sup>h</sup>, Period iv. 49, Cycle iii. 11 of the Macedo-Syrian calendar, bore date August 30; and B. C. 25, Period iv. 53, Cycle iii. 15, Sept. 14.

From the next allusion to this subject<sup>k</sup>, it appears the bequest of Sosibius continued for some time to be applied according to his directions; but that afterwards the funds which he had left having begun to be diverted to other purposes, the people of Antioch applied to the emperor Claudius for permission to buy from the people of Pisa the privilege of celebrating the Olympic games at Antioch; and obtained leave to do so, *Æræ Antiochenæ* 92.

The *Æra* of Antioch followed by Malela is the *Æra* *Cæsarea*, dated from the *Ἀυτονομία*<sup>l</sup>, Hyperberetæus 1 = October 1, U. C. 705, B. C. 49, which is also his epoch of the cycle of Indiction. This application then was made U. C. 796–797, A. D. 43–44, Olymp. ccv. 3, 4; and we may suppose that the bargain with the people of Pisa, according to Malela, was concluded sometime U. C. 796, A. D. 43, and the games by

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 224. 7–21 sq. cf. 248. 19—  
249. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Pag. 364. 5–10.

<sup>g</sup> See Vol. iii. 521 sqq.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. iii. Appendix, Table xix.

<sup>k</sup> ix. 248. 5.

<sup>l</sup> Cf. Vol. iii. 447.

virtue of it first celebrated U. C. 797, A. D. 44, Olymp. ccv. 4. He continues <sup>m</sup>: Καὶ ἐπετέλεσαν οἱ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμενοι κατὰ τὸ πρόην ἔθος πάλιν τὸν τῶν σκηρικῶν καὶ ἀθλητῶν, θυμελικῶν καὶ τραγικῶν καὶ ἵππικῶν, ἀγῶνα, καὶ λοιπὸν τὰς λ' ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ τῆς ρουμηρίας τοῦ Ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς, κατὰ πέντε ἔτη ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ πενταετοῦς φθάσαντος. The calendar was still lunar A. D. 44; and Hyperberetæus that year, Period v. 45 *exennite*, bore date Sept. 13, and was a full month, and had 30 days—as Malela seems to imply it had.

He adds however that after this they were repeatedly interrupted: Διαφόρων πολέμων κινήτων ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ (no doubt between the Romans and the Parthians), οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ληφθείσης ὑπὸ ἐναντίων, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ θεομηρίας γενομένης, καὶ διαφόρων σεισμῶν καὶ ἐμπρησμῶν, ἀνεβάλοιτο καὶ τὴν κατὰ πενταετῆ χρόνον... ἀγῶνος θέαι, ἀλλ' ἐπετέλεσαν ἄλλας διαφόρους περιόδους ἐξ τὴν αὐτὴν προειρημένην πανήγυριν, δι' ἐναντῶν ι' ἢ καὶ κ', ὡς ἐὰν αὐτοῖς ἔδοξε, μετὰ τὸ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι, καὶ ἐν εἰρήρῃ διάγειν <sup>n</sup>. What capture of Antioch by enemies, between A. D. 44 and 164, could have been meant here, it would be difficult to say; but the fact of earthquakes, very destructive to Antioch, within that interval of time, is on record<sup>o</sup>. Malela's meaning however in general must have been that, owing to unavoidable interruptions for one reason or other, the games in question, instead of being regularly celebrated every four years, from the epoch of their reinstatement, A. D. 44, were celebrated *de facto* only six times, at intervals of 15 or 20 years asunder—which would bring down their history from A. D. 44 to A. D. 134 or A. D. 164.

The next mention of these games, as the text of Malela stands at present <sup>p</sup>, occurs in the reign of Commodus; which the necessity of the case requires to be understood of that of Caracalla, or Antoninus Bassianus: when an application is said to have been made at the beginning of his reign, to confirm the appropriation of the revenues in question to the *Commune* of Antioch: Καὶ εὐθέως ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς....προσεκύρωσε τῷ δημοσίῳ τὰς προσόδους, θεσπίσας τὰ Ὀλύμπια κ', τ. λ. κατὰ τετραετῆ χρόνον ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ἀμέμπτως ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς τῶν

<sup>m</sup> ix. 249. 8.<sup>n</sup> x. 249. 15.<sup>o</sup> See Vol. iii. 536.<sup>p</sup> xii. 284. 1—285. 5.

ἀναθημάτων\*, ἦτοι θυσίων, τῶν ἐξ ἔθους· τοῦτ' ἔστι τῷ Πανέμφῳ ἦτοι Ἰουλίῳ μηνί, καὶ τῷ Λῶφ τῷ λεγομένῳ Ἀγούστῳ μηνί, ἐπὶ ἡμέρας μέ', εἰς ἑορτὴν τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς, ὡσαύτως ἀφορίσας καὶ εἰς λόγον ἵπποδρομίου ἀμέπτως ἐπιτελουμένου κατὰ τὴν ἡλίον ἡμέραν, τοῦτ' ἔστι κατὰ κυριακὴν, ἄλλην ἐξ αὐτῶν φανερὰν χρυσίου ποσότητα. A part of the funds also was to be reserved from this time forward for the celebration of a triennial festival for 30 days, in the month Artemisius or May, called Orgia, or Maiumas, in honour of Dionysos and Aphrodite: i. e. twice in every cycle of the Olympia. The calendar of Antioch at this time was solar.

The games first celebrated by virtue of this permission are dated *Æræ* 260 (σχ') 4, U. C. 964–965, A. D. 211–212 (in the first year of the reign of Caracalla): the people of Antioch, as Malela supposes, having thus bought of the people of Pisa ἀγράφῳ πάκτῳ, the right to celebrate them, for 90 cycles, 360 years, from *Æræ* 260–620, A. D. 212–572. It is hereby implied that, without any change in the cycle, the stated month of the games was transferred from Hyperberetæus to Panemus, i. e. from October to July, and so brought much nearer to the proper Olympic season than it had ever been until then. There is more in reference to this first celebration of the games according to the new rule<sup>†</sup>: and it appears that a dole of bread to the people of Antioch, out of the revenues of one Artabanus, a citizen of Antioch, and the first or second<sup>§</sup> Alytarch or President of the new games, was instituted at the same time. This date of the new Olympia, according to the old cycle, Olymp. ccxlvii. 4, A. D. 212, is confirmed by the sequel of their history; so as to leave no doubt that they must have been instituted in the reign of Caracalla, not of Commodus †.

\* This 'Εορτὴ τῶν ἀναθημάτων is alluded to in Malela, v. 130. 6, as the date of the death of Achilles, and of an annual sacrifice to the Thymbræan Apollo by both the Greeks and the Trojans: on the authority of Dictys Cretensis, (132, 133.) discovered in the reign of Claudius, in the 13th of his reign, (cf. x. 250. 1.)

† The Paschal Chronicon indeed (490. 7–16.) dates this bequest of Artabanus' Olymp. ccxl. 2, Indiction 3, answering to A. D. 182, though

‡ xii. 286. 5.

† Ibid. 287. 19: 289. 12.

§ Cf. 286. 12, which recognises one Aphronius as the first.



There is next an account of a disturbance at Antioch<sup>t</sup>, at the time of these Olympia, when the synagogue of the Jews was burnt down. It is dated July 9, in the third consulate of Anastasius, Indiction 15, when the *εἰσελασία* was going on. Anastasius' third consulate in the Tables bears date A. D. 507, Indiction 14 of the common reckoning, Indiction 15 of Malela's. But A. D. 507 could not have been Olympic by the cycle of the games, and therefore, unless they were anticipated, A. D. 507 must be in error for A. D. 508. If however the *εἰσελασία* was going on July 9, and it was the day after the games, it is observable that it would be the 16th day from June 24, the date of the summer solstice in the Julian calendar: and that may lead to the inference that the rule was now (and of course had been from A. D. 212) for the games to begin on the eleventh day from that date, July 4, and to last to the fifteenth inclusive, July 8; and that the 45 days, specified supra<sup>u</sup>, according to the same rule, extended from July 4 to August 18, Panemus 4 to Louis 18\*.

The final suppression of these games is dated in the reign of Justin<sup>v</sup>, *Ærae* 568: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐκώλυσε τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ὀλυμπίων, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπὸ Ἰνδικτιῶνος ιδ'. ἀλυτάρχησαν δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀφρανίου ἕως ὀγδόου ἐξηκοστοῦ πεντακοσιοστοῦ (ἔτους) ἀφ' οὗ ἐκώλυθη τὰ Ὀλύμπια, Ἀλύταρχοι ος'. *Ærae* 568 answered to U. C. 1272–1273, A. D. 519–520; Indiction 12 by the common reckoning, Indiction 13 by Malela's: and A. D. 520 being Olympic by the Antiochene cycle (Olymp. cccxxiv. 4), Malela's meaning probably was that they were permitted to be held, A. D. 520, for the last time, and after that suppressed. In their own *Ærae*, reckoned

under the consuls of A. D. 181. For Malela's history of the Games from A. D. 212 forwards, see xii. 307. 5–16: 310. 7: 311. 12. in the reign of Diocletian and Maximin: xiv. 362. 18. in that of Theodosius the younger (cf. xiii. 346. 5, in the reign of Theodosius the elder).

\* It is observable that the horse-races, instituted on the same occasion, (A. D. 212,) according to Malela, were appointed to be held on the Sunday; and yet July 9, A. D. 508, Dom. Lett. FE, was a Wednesday. But A. D. 212, Dom. Lett. DC, July 4, was a Sunday; and if the games were celebrated first, according to the new rule, on that day, that might give occasion to the statement on this point.

<sup>t</sup> xvi. 395. 20—396. 12.

<sup>u</sup> xii. 284. 9–21. cf. p. 616.

<sup>v</sup> xvii. 417. 5.

from July 4, A. D. 212, this cycle would answer to Olymp. lxxviii. 1: and from the first Alytarch or President, before called Aphronius, and here Aphranius, there must have been 77, as Malela says there were\*.

\* The above account of these games, according to Malela, is competent to shew that he may be trusted for the chronology of their history from B. C. 29 or 25 to A. D. 520. It is possible too that, whether for the confirmation of the original bequest, or in order to its better application to the purposes for which it was intended, or to its appropriation in any other way, the people of Antioch might have occasion to apply to the Roman emperor—as Malela supposes them to have *twice* done, once in the reign of Claudius, and again in that of Commodus or Caracalla. But that it should have been necessary, for the foundation of such games as these at Antioch, to obtain the consent of those who had the charge of the Olympic games for the time being, whether the people of Pisa, as Malela supposed, or the people of Elis, is a supposition in which we need not hesitate to say he must have been mistaken. The history of the games of antiquity is demonstrative that there were at this very time, in a variety of quarters, Olympia, as they were called, regulated by a cycle of four years, which were not supposed to interfere with the Olympia, properly so called, nor the Olympia with them, nor either to be in the least degree connected with or dependent on the other: and there was no reason *a priori* why Antioch should not have had games of its own, of this denomination, as much as any other place. The statement that the people of Antioch bought the right of celebrating the Olympic games for 360 years, from the people of Pisa, or people of Elis, A. D. 212, is confuted by the fact of which we were made cognizant by the testimony of Philostratus *supra*<sup>1</sup>, that the games were celebrated at Olympia as usual, A. D. 213, and by the Olympic *Ἀναγραφαὶ*, shewing that the games went on as low down as A. D. 229 or 249, at least. Not to mention that, if the Olympia properly so called had been transferred to Antioch, instead of Olympia, the cycle of the Antiochene Olympia and the Olympic from that time forward also must have been the same; though in point of fact they were different after A. D. 212 as much as before.

Allusions to these Olympia at Antioch occur in the extant orations of Libanius, involving also the chronology of his personal history, and especially the question of the date of his birth, about which considerable uncertainty has hitherto been supposed to exist. It may not be amiss in the first place to collect what may be gleaned from these allusions in illustration of the games, and in the next to infer from them, if possible, the true date of the birth of Libanius.

i. Then it appears from these testimonies that the Olympia at Antioch were sacred to Zeus, as much as those at Elis<sup>2</sup>: *Καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐρρῦετο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκείνου τὴν ἑορτὴν ἑαυτοῦ*. ii. That these too were celebrated in

<sup>1</sup> Page 506.

<sup>2</sup> i. 138. 3. Oratio i. Περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης.

the summer<sup>3</sup>—Τὰ μὲν δὴ Ὀλύμπια ἐποιεῖτο τῷ Ὀλυμπίῳ Διὶ. . . ἐμὲ δὲ τὰ τε ἄλλα ἔτηκε καὶ ἀγρυνπνία. διὰ πικροῦ δὴ τοῦ θέρους τούτου οἶδα ἐλθῶν—Καί-  
τοι τὰ μὲν Ὀλύμπια θέρους ἐστὶν ἑορτὴ καὶ ποιεῖ τινα τοῖς δακτύλοις ὄκνον<sup>4</sup>.  
And it appears both from these, and from other allusions<sup>5</sup>, that they were  
celebrated in the heat of the summer. iii. That the locality of these games  
was Daphne, the suburb of Antioch<sup>6</sup>—Τὶς ἑορτὴν ἐρεῖ τὰ Ὀλύμπια, τοῦ  
πτόματος ἐγγύθεν ἐπεμβάλλοντος ὄδουρμόν. The temple of Apollo, the  
temple of Zeus, and the Olympic stadium, were all situated there<sup>7</sup>: Ἀπόλ-  
λωνος ἱερόν, Διὸς ἱερόν, στάδιον Ὀλυμπικόν θεάζον ἀπάσης τέρψεως, κυπα-  
ρίττων πλήθος καὶ πάχος καὶ ὕψος. iv. Women were excluded from these  
games, as they were from the Olympic<sup>8</sup>: Νῦν δ' ὅταν ἀνδρῶν μόνων ποιῶ-  
μεν τὴν Δάφνην, τὰς γυναῖκας δὲ ἕξω τῶν ἐκείνης ὀρίων, τί ποιοῦμεν; φαν-  
λοτέραν τὴν Δάφνην; ἱερωτέραν μὲν οὖν. v. We have seen from Malela  
that the official title of the presidents of these games was Ἀλύταρχοι, and  
we have also seen supra<sup>9</sup>, that the title of one of the presidents at the  
Olympia was Ἀλυτάρχης too. From these allusions of Libanius, it ap-  
pears that the style of those, who had the charge of these Antiochene Olym-  
pia, in general was the same as that of those at Olympia, Hellanodikæ,  
Mastigophori, Agonothetæ, and the like<sup>10</sup>: Κελευόντων μὲν τινῶν τὰ ἄριστα  
ποιεῖν τὰ δείπνα τόν τε ἀγνωσθέτην τοὺς τε Ἑλλανοδικας, καὶ πειθόντων—  
Ἦσαν δὲ οὗτοι μαστιγοφόροι τε καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἡ κρίσις<sup>11</sup>—Οὐ τὸ τῶν Ἡλείων  
σεμνὸν ἐνταῦθα μετελήλυθε, καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους τῶν Ὀλυμπίων τῇ πρὸς τὸν  
Δία τιμῇ παρηνέγκαμεν; τοῦτον ἤδη τις τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ βασιλεὺς \* ἔθηκε, καὶ  
τὴν αὐτοῦ στολὴν ἀφείδς τὴν Ὀλυμπιακὴν ἔλαβεν, ὁ δὲ τις Ἑλλανοδικῆς ὤφθη,  
καὶ τὸν ἐκ δάφνης ἀμφέθετο σχήματος (corr. στέφανον), κοσμοῦντες ὁμοῦ καὶ  
κοσμούμενοι τοῖς δρωμένοις<sup>12</sup>. vi. The kinds of contests and exhibitions on  
these occasions appear to have been the same in both instances. The con-  
test of heralds and trumpeters at least made part of these games at An-  
tioch, as it did of those at Elis<sup>13</sup>. Τῶν γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς δρωμέων ὁ μὲν σαλ-

\* Possibly Adrian is here meant, who might some time or other have presided  
at these games. The strain of these observations indeed appears to confirm Ma-  
lela's statement, that the people of Antioch bought the privilege of celebrating  
Olympia, after the model of the games properly so called, from the people of Elis.  
But it must have been merely the privilege of having games at Antioch, german  
to those at Olympia in every respect but the cycle (for that must have been dif-  
ferent in any case). On this principle, the Olympic games would go on as usual  
at Olympia, even though in the proper years they might be going on at Antioch  
also.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 119. 17.

<sup>4</sup> iii. 123. 2. xiv. Περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἑορ-  
ταῖς κλησέων.

<sup>5</sup> i. 120 6. i. Περὶ τῆς ἐ. τύχ. 262.  
12 sqq: 266. 2 sqq. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλέ-  
θρου.

<sup>6</sup> iii. 333. 28. lxi. Μονοψία ἐπὶ τῷ  
ἐν Δάφνῃ νεῶ.

<sup>7</sup> i. 351. 7. xi. Ἀντιοχικός. cf. 551. 18.

<sup>8</sup> i. 271. 12. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλέθρου.

<sup>9</sup> Page 587 note.

<sup>10</sup> i. 266. 15. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλέθρου.  
The Πλέθριον itself was the name of the  
locality where the Hellanodikæ sate  
during the games at Olympia. See page  
609 supra.

<sup>11</sup> i. 262. 15. ibid.

<sup>12</sup> i. 364. 9. xi. Ἀντιοχικός.

<sup>13</sup> See page 609 supra, note.

πιγκτής καὶ ὁ κήρυξ ἀπάντων ἦν ἀκούσαι<sup>14</sup>. We learn too from these testimonies that the time assigned to the contests of the athletes originally was the hottest part of the day, though in Libanius' own time they had been transferred to the afternoon<sup>15</sup>: Τοῦτι δὲ ὑπὲρ οὔπερ ὁ νῦν λόγος ἐδέχεται μὲν τοὺς ἀθλητὰς ὥραν ὀγδόην τε καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, ἐδέχεται δὲ τοὺς θεατὰς ἀσίτους, ὁ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ καύματος διεκώλυε βλαβὴν—Τελευτώντων μὲν τῶν παρὰ τῶν ἀθλητῶν εἰς ἡλίου δύσιν, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τουτωνὶ τῶν ἔργων κεκινήσθαι χρόνον. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἦν βραδύτερον ἀρχομένοις βραδύτερον πεπαύσθαι, τολμώντων φανερώς ὁμολογεῖν τῶν πολλῶν μὴ ἂν δύνασθαι τὸ καῦμα ἀνέχεσθαι, τῶν προτέρων ἐπὶ τῷ πάνυ δύνασθαι φιλοτιμουμένων<sup>16</sup>. Finally, the number of days for which these games at Antioch lasted was not less than three<sup>17</sup>: Καὶ τὸ νῦν τριῶν ἡμερῶν (ἐξόν) ὄλα δούναι τῷ μηνί.

It appears from these testimonies of Libanius also, that while the people of Antioch were thus celebrating these Olympic games of theirs, the Olympia properly so called continued to be still celebrated by the Eleans, though on a scale of splendour and solemnity much inferior to that of these<sup>18</sup>: Εἰ δὲ Ἡλείοις τᾶλλα οὐχ ὡς ἄριστα πράττουσιν ἢ πανήγυρις φέρει τι σχήματος, τί τό γε ἡμέτερον νυμίζειν (δεῖ); οἱ μετὰ τῆς αἰλλης τύχης καὶ τῆ τῶν Ὀλυμπιῶν φαιδρότητι κεκρατήκαμεν—Ταῦτα εἰδότες Ἡλείοι μεγαλοφρονουσι τῷ μόλις ἐπτὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀποδύεσθαι· τοιοῦτον δέ τι καὶ τὸ τῶν Δελφῶν παρ' ἄλλοις δέ γε ἀθλητῶν ἀγέλαι δευτέρας ἡμέρας εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα δεόμεναι<sup>19</sup>.

ii. With regard to the question of the birth of Libanius, and how far these allusions to the Antiochene Olympia are calculated to throw any light upon it, it clearly appears from his testimony that the cycle of these Olympia was one of *four* years, like that of the Olympia, properly so called<sup>20</sup>: Καί τοι τέτταρα μὲν καὶ δέκα ἐγεγόνειν ἔτη Πανοββίου ποιούντος τὰ Ὀλύμπια· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος μητρὸς ἐμῆς ἀδελφός. ὀκτωκαίδεκα δὲ Ἄργυρίου φίλος δὲ οὗτος τοῦμοῦ πατρός κ', τ. λ. τέτταρα τοίνυν ἔτερα δύο μὲν ἐμὲ καὶ εἴκοσιν ἐποίει, Φασγανίου δὲ τὸν στέφανον (τῆς δάφνης scil.<sup>21</sup>) θεῖος δὲ καὶ οὗτος ἐμὸς ὡσπερ ὁ Πανόλβιος. Three consecutive Olympia are thus specified, four years asunder, and in the 14th, the 18th, the 22nd year of his own age, respectively; and besides these he alludes to another case of the same kind, in the 50th year of his own age, (just 28 years, or seven cycles, after that in his 22nd)—Τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἦν μὲν Ὀλύμπια, τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, ἔτος δὲ ἐμοὶ πεντηκοστόν<sup>22</sup>.

The opinions of chronologers have commonly varied only between two years as those of his birth, A. D. 314 and A. D. 315. It is difficult to decide between them; though, of the two, we incline to the conclusion that the true year was A. D. 314. The first year in his lifetime which could have been Olympic at Antioch, must have been the second, if the

14 i. 262. 11. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλήθρου.

15 i. 262. 12. *ibid*.

16 *Ibid*. 266. 2.

17 i. 273. 4. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλήθρου.

18 i. 364. 16. Ἀντιοχικός.

19 i. 272. 7. x. Περὶ τοῦ Πλήθρου.

20 iii. 110. 5. liv. Περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς κλησέων. cf. i. 12. 4-9 sqq. i.

Περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης. i. 6. 4 sqq. *ibid*.

21 See page 619.

22 i. 94. 7. i. Περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης.

fourteenth, the eighteenth, the twenty-second, and the fiftieth, respectively were so; and supposing him to have been born A. D. 314, Olymp. cclxxiii. 2. in the course of the summer of that year, a little later than the usual time of the games at Antioch, his second year *exeunte* would coincide with the Olympic season, and the Olympia of Antioch, A. D. 316, Olymp. cclxxiii. 4. And that year of his life having been Olympic at Antioch, A. D. 328, his 14th year *exeunte*, Olymp. cclxxvi. 4, A. D. 332, his 18th *exeunte*, Olymp. cclxxvii. 4, A. D. 336, his 22nd *exeunte*, Olymp. cclxxviii. 4, and A. D. 364, his 50th *exeunte*, Olymp. cclxxxv. 4, would be so as matter of course.

Let us therefore consider the Olympia which are said to have fallen out in his 50th year, a little particularly, in order to see whether these are not determinable to A. D. 364.

We observe then, first of all, that the temple of Apollo, at Daphne, (the quarter where the Antiochene Olympia were usually celebrated,) was burnt to the ground xi. Kal. Nov. (Oct. 22) A. D. 362<sup>23</sup>, when the emperor Julian was at Antioch. A *Μονοδία* of Libanius' is extant, produced by this event<sup>24</sup>, in which he alludes to the Olympia also, as follows: 'Ολύμπια μὲν οὐ μάλα πόρρω, συγκαλέσει δὲ ἡ πανήγυρις τὰς πόλεις· αἱ δὲ ἤξουσι βοῦς ἄγουσαι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι θυσίαν. τί δράσομεν; ποῖ καταδυσόμεθα, κ', τ. λ.<sup>25</sup> The Olympia then had not been celebrated A. D. 362, nor, as we may presume, A. D. 361, and yet were not far distant, October 22, A. D. 362. They would therefore be in course either A. D. 363 or 364; and to decide between these years we may observe, i. That Libanius' οὐ μάλα πόρρω, as referrible to the Olympic cycle, (a period of four years,) can scarcely be understood of less than half the cycle, i. e. two years. ii. The emperor Julian, as it is well known, spent the latter half of A. D. 362, and the first two months of A. D. 363, at Antioch, before he set out on his Persian expedition, and during that time the people of Antioch fell into disgrace with him, and they were still in disgrace when he set out at the beginning of March, A. D. 363; so much so, that before his departure he gave them to understand that, on his return, after the first year's campaign, he should winter at Tarsus, not at Antioch. Now an oration of Libanius' is extant<sup>26</sup>, written, as if in order to be delivered in the presence of Julian, upon his return, in the name of the city, with a view to persuade him to retract this determination, and to winter again at Antioch; and it is so expressed, as if Libanius had delivered this harangue before the emperor in the fifth month from his departure, (i. e. July or August,) as the departure took place at the beginning of March: Καὶ μὴν οὐτοσὶ πέμπτος τῇ τιμωρίᾳ<sup>27</sup>. There is another<sup>28</sup>, which professes to have been delivered to the people of Antioch, in the absence of Julian, as if to persuade them to pacify his anger, by inflicting some voluntary punishment on themselves, i. e. abstaining from most of their usual amusements while they were still in disgrace with

<sup>23</sup> Ammianus Marc. xxii. 13. p. 315.

<sup>24</sup> Opp. iii. 332. Oratio lxi.

<sup>25</sup> Pag. 333. 24.

<sup>26</sup> i. 451. xv. Πρεσβευτικὸς πρὸς

Ἰουλιανόν.

<sup>27</sup> i. 476. 14.

<sup>28</sup> i. 484. xvi. Πρὸς Ἀντιοχέας, περὶ τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ὀργῆς.

him<sup>29</sup>: Κλείσωμεν βραχὺν χρόνον τὸ θέατρον, καὶ δεηθῶμεν τῶν ὀρχηστῶν . . ἡμῖν (δ') ἐπιτρέψαι τὸ θέρος ἄνευ τέρψεως διαγαγεῖν. τὰς τῶν ἵππων ἀμίλλας εἰς ἐλάττους συστειλωμεν ἄθλους, ἐξ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐκκαίδεκα τάξαντες. Yet there is not a word in either in allusion to the Olympia, which could scarcely have failed to be noticed had they been in course, June or July, A. D. 363. Lastly, it is well known that the day of the death of Julian was June 26, this year<sup>30</sup>, and yet it appears from the *Μονωδία*<sup>31</sup> ἐπὶ Ἰουλιανῷ that on that very day the people of Antioch were celebrating the feast of the Nymphs at Daphne: Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔκειτο ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν Δάφνῃ τὰς Νύμφας ἐθεραπεύομεν ὀρχήσει τε καὶ ταῖς ἄλλας χάρισιν, εἰδότες ὧν ἐπεπόνθειμεν οὐδέν. This festival was instituted in the time of Adrian, and its stated date was Dæsius, or June 23<sup>32</sup>, so that if it lasted till June 26 it must have lasted four days. Had the Olympia also been in course so close to them as July 4, or in fact any time between June 26 and the receipt at Antioch of the news of the death of Julian<sup>34</sup>, Libanius would certainly have mentioned them, and insisted on the contrast between such a celebrity and a public calamity like that of the death of Julian.

It follows that the true year of these Olympia having been A. D. 364, that was the 50th year of the life-time of Libanius; and therefore that he must have been born a little later than the usual season of the Olympia at Antioch, A. D. 314. We will add this further argument of the true year of his birth—that as Morell, in the *Vita Libanii*<sup>35</sup>, observes, he tells us himself, in one of his *Epistles*<sup>36</sup>, that he was born in the year in which the grandfather of the person to whom that *Epistle* is addressed (*Posthumnianus*) was consul, and, as he implies, consul ordinarius or ἐπόννυμος. Now of these three years, A. D. 314, 315, and 316, the consules ordinarii A. D. 315 were the two emperors Constantine and Licinius. A. D. 314 and A. D. 316, they were two private individuals: in the former, C. Sejonius Rufus Volusianus II. and Annianus; in the latter, Sabinus and Rufinus: and since of these A. D. 316, as the date of the birth of Libanius, is out of the question, the true year must have been A. D. 314; in which case, of the two consuls of this year, the grandfather of *Posthumnianus* was probably Annianus, consul then for the *first* time, not his colleague, consul for the *second* time.

The allusion to these Olympia in his 50th year occurs in the *Oration De Sua ipsius Fortuna*, in the account of the dangers to which he represents his life as having been exposed after the death of Julian, in consequence of the regret which he had both felt and expressed for that event. Julian was now dead<sup>37</sup>, and he refers both to him and his successor in the following terms<sup>38</sup>: Ἰουλιανὸν μὲν ἐκείνον ἐν σορῷ φέρεσθαι τοῦ δείνος δὲ γεγενῆσθαι τὸ σκῆπτρον: which, in our opinion, points plainly to the emperor *Jovian*—though the editors of *Libanius* do not appear to have so under-

29 i. 500. 10. *ibid.*

30 *Ammianus Marc.* xxv. 5. 48: 3. 39: 4. 43.

31 i. 515. 4. xvii.

32 *Malela.* xi. 277. 20-278. 19. See *Vol.* iii. 446.

34 *Cf.* i. 519, 520. *ibid.*: i. 625. 1. xviii. Ἐπιτάφιος ἐπὶ Ἰουλιανῷ.

35 *Operum* i. *Reiske*, at the beginning.

36 *Epp.* 956. 37 i. 91. 3-11.

38 *Page.* 91. 10.

stood it. For, if we refer to Ammianus Marcellinus<sup>39</sup>, we shall see that Procopius was sent by Jovian from Nisibis with the body of Julian, in order that it might be buried in the suburbs of Tarsus; a commission which he had executed before the arrival of Jovian himself at Tarsus, in the depth of winter, or, as Ammianus expresses it, *flagrante hieme*. Consequently the end of A. D. 363, or the beginning of A. D. 364<sup>40</sup>. This allusion then refers to the time when the body was still on the road to Tarsus; and *ὁ δεῖνα*, who was supposed to have succeeded meanwhile to the sceptre, could have meant none but Jovian. Nor is it likely that he would speak of Valens in particular as *ὁ δεῖνα*, of whom he speaks soon after as *τοῦ βασιλέως* absolutely<sup>41</sup>.

He alludes again to this successor of Julian<sup>42</sup>, where he is giving an account of some plot against himself, contrived by certain persons whom he had made his enemies by having denounced them in a letter of his own to Julian, while still alive and absent: *Ῥφ' ἧς ἂν αὐτοῖς δυσμενῆς ἐπανῆκεν ἐκείνος*: and who were influenced at this time also by the hope of ingratiating themselves with his successor, by denouncing Libanius: *Καὶ γὰρ ἂν δῶρά σφισι παρὰ τοῦ τὰ σκῆπτρα λαβόντος γενέσθαι*: and this too must have been Jovian, still in Upper Asia. He adds, even after he had escaped this plot<sup>43</sup>; *Μετὰ ταῦτα τοίνυν ἀνὴρ βάρβαρος ἐξώργιζε τὸν κρατοῦντα ἐπ' ἐμέ, λέγων ὡς οὐ πανοίμην θρηγῶν τὴν τοῦ πεσόντος πληγὴν. ὁ δὲ ἐμελλε μὲν ἀπολεῖν με κακῶς, δίκην οὐδύνης πραττόμενος*. He would not have ventured to speak thus of Valens; and it is self-evident that an accusation of this kind was much more likely to have been preferred against him a few months after the death of Julian, (consequently in the reign of Jovian,) than a few years after, (in that of Valens.)

He closes his account with observing, *Τοσαῦται μὲν αἱ τρικνμῖαι, τοσαῦται δὲ αἱ ἀρωγαί*—and then passes to the Olympia in the 50th year of his own age. Jovian died in February, A. D. 364, and he might naturally pass from the end of his reign, at this time, to the Olympia at midsummer the same year. Let us observe however in what manner he speaks of them on this occasion, and in connection with his own history; *Τὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἦν μὲν Ὀλύμπια τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν, ἔτος δὲ ἐμοὶ πεντηκοστὸν, ἐπιθυμία τε τῆς πανηγύρεως ὑπερφυῆς. παρακίψας δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἐορτῆς δεσμώτης ἦν*. i. e. he was seized with a fit of the gout: for that it appears is his meaning: and this lasted *four* years (from the 50th to the 54th of his life<sup>44</sup>): *Καὶ ὁ κλύδων οὗτος ἔτη τέτταρα ἐπεκράτει*. He then put himself under the directions of Æsculapius<sup>45</sup>—*Καὶ καταφεύγω δὲ οἰκέτου πρὸς ἐτόιμον ἀμύρειν τὸν μέγαν Ἀσκληπιόν*: and this must have gone on three years, since he observes directly after<sup>46</sup>, *Καὶ ἦν μὲν ἔτος ἑβδομον ἐπὶ τοῖς πενήκοντα λῆγον ἦδη*. If so, from the end of his 54th to the end of his 57th year. All this is consistent, if he was really born soon after midsummer, A. D. 314, and this attack took him at midsummer, A. D. 364, towards the end of his 50th year.

<sup>39</sup> xxv. 9. p. 62. 8. 59: cf. xxiii. 2.

<sup>334</sup>. also Libanius, xv. Πρεσβευτικός.  
<sup>451</sup>. 482. 18.

<sup>40</sup> Ammian. xxv. 10. 63, 64.

<sup>41</sup> Pag. 96. 18.

<sup>42</sup> Pag. 92. 5—93. 3.

<sup>43</sup> 93. 16.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. 94. 10—96. 7.

<sup>45</sup> 96. 8.

<sup>46</sup> 96. 15.

And finally, these dates are confirmed by an allusion to the coming of the king to Antioch, which occurs soon after<sup>47</sup>: Οὕτω δὴ τοῦ βασιλέως ἤκοντος—and to Libanius' declaiming before him. This king was Valens: and some coming of Valens' to Antioch is referred to again<sup>48</sup>—"Ἀρξάντες δὲ πρὶν ἢ Βάλεντα δεῦρ' ἦκειν. The context determines this visit to the end of the summer, A. D. 371, in the 57th year of the age of Libanius *exeunte*. Malela indeed dates it Nov. 10, Indiction 14<sup>49</sup>, which according to his rule would be A. D. 370. But Mr. Clinton has shewn that the true year must have been A. D. 371<sup>50</sup>.

We have dwelt however long enough on these subjects. We will observe only that Libanius has an allusion to a show of gladiators in his 15th year<sup>51</sup>—which would be A. D. 328–329; and he mentions his 67th year in the Oration *πρὸς τοὺς βαρὺν αὐτὸν καλέσαντας*<sup>52</sup>, A. D. 380–381; and alludes to the battle of Adrianople (Aug. 8, A. D. 378<sup>53</sup>), in which Valens lost his life, as a past event, but not long past<sup>54</sup>.

47 96. 18—97. 10.

48 i. 103. 21. 49 338. 14.

50 F. Romani, in A. D. 371.

51 i. 6. 8. Περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τύχης. cf.

52 i. 172. 9. Oratio ii.

53 Cf. Amm. Marc. xxxi. 12. 277 :

13. 281 : 14. 283.

54 i. 189. 5–12. Orat. ii.



## DISSERTATION XII.

### *On the Pythian Games of Antiquity, and on the Lunar Calendar of Delphi.*

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *On the institution of the Pythian Games, and on the author of the institution.*

---

##### SECTION I.—*On the original Cycle of the Pythian Games.*

THE second of the Games of the Period in dignity and estimation, if not in antiquity also, were the Pythian. The first observation which we may make upon these is *this*; That, whereas each of the rest was regulated at first by a cycle of four years, and consequently was a *πενταετηρίς* or *τετραετηρίς*, these in particular were regulated by one of eight years, and consequently were an *ἐνναετηρίς* or *ὀκταετηρίς*. And though these also, in the course of time, came to be subjected to a cycle of four years; yet the old period of the institution was never entirely laid aside, but, under the name of the *Πυθιάς*, properly so called, was kept up down to the latest times. The proofs of this fact, we trust, will appear by and by. At present we shall produce only two testimonies to the original rule of the Pythian games, in contradistinction to that of the rest of the Period; one from Censorinus, the other from the argument of the Pythian Odes of Pindar.

i. Ob hoc multæ in Græcia religiones hoc intervallo temporis (τῆς ὀκταετηρίδος scil.) summa cæremonia coluntur. Delphis quoque ludi qui vocantur Pythia post octavum annum olim conficiebantur<sup>v</sup> — ii. Ἐτελεῖτο δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν καταρχὰς μὲν

<sup>v</sup> De Die, xviii.

διὰ ἑνναετηρίδος, μετέστη δὲ εἰς πενταετηρίδα διὰ τὸ τὰς Παρρασίδας νόμφας Ἀπόλλωνι κτείναντι τὸ θηρίον τὰς ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὀπώρας προσενεγκεῖν δῶρα<sup>x</sup>.

Another circumstance of difference, between these games and those of the rest of the Period, was this; That the latter from the first were *gymnastic*, i. e. devoted to contests of bodily strength and activity; the former were *musical*, i. e. intended for nothing but an exhibition of music and song—and properly of the music of the *κιθάρα* or harp, accompanied with song. And though these also, in process of time, became gymnastic, yet the contests of music, peculiar to the Pythia from the first, continued to be their principal and most characteristic distinction.

SECTION II.—*On the traditionary author of the Pythian Institution, or Pythian Chorus. Testimonies.*

i. Ἀλλὰ καὶ Φιλάμμωνα τὸν Δελφὸν Λητοῦς τε καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος γένεσιν δηλώσαι ἐν μέλεσι, καὶ χοροὺς πρώτων περὶ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερὸν στήσαι<sup>y</sup>—Τινὰς δὲ τῶν νόμων τῶν κιθαρωδικῶν, τῶν ὑπὸ Τερπάνδρου πεποιημένων, Φιλάμμονά φασι τὸν ἀρχαῖον τὸν Δελφὸν συστήσασθαι<sup>z</sup>.

ii. Philammon Delphius jamjam ætatem attigerat. is autem erat qui primus apud Pythios constituit choros<sup>a</sup>—Philammon Delphius nobilis habetur, qui primus apud Pythium chorum constituit<sup>b</sup>—Φιλάμμων ὁ Δελφὸς ἤκμαξεν, ὁ πρῶτος στήσας Πυθοῖ χορόν<sup>c</sup>—Tunc Apollini Delphico (in the time of Joshua) instituti sunt Ludi musici<sup>d</sup>—Linus, Philammon, Thamyris, Amphion, Musæus, Orpheus<sup>f</sup>—Ὁ Θάμυρις δὲ καὶ ὁ Φιλάμμων οὐ πολὺ τούτων (the Demodocus and Phemius of the Odyssey) εἰσὶν ἀρχαιότεροι<sup>g</sup>—Λίνος δὲ καὶ Μουσαῖος ἀμφὶ τὰ Ἰρωικὰ ἐγενέσθη, καὶ Θάμυρις μετὰ τούτων, καὶ Φιλάμμων ὡσαύτως<sup>i</sup>.

iii. Πρῶτά νυν Ὀρφῆος<sup>k</sup>... Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ 5<sup>τῇ</sup> Φιλάμμονά φησι καὶ οὐκ Ὀρφέα συμπεπλευκέναι (τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις)—The first victor in the contest of music at Delphi, Χρυσόθεμις ἐκ Κρήτης,

<sup>x</sup> Argumentum Pythium Tertium.

<sup>y</sup> Plutarch, De Musica, iii.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. v.

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ad ann. 724.

<sup>b</sup> Chronicon of Jerome, ad ann. 735.

<sup>c</sup> Syncellus, 307. 13.

<sup>d</sup> Augustin, De Civitate, xviii. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Tatian, Oratio ad Græcos, lxii.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. lxiii. cf. Eusebius, Præp. Evangelica, x. 11. 522. 27: 523. 30.

<sup>i</sup> Theodoret, Græc. Affect. Curatio, ii. 79. § 29.

<sup>k</sup> Apollonius Rhod. i. 23. and the Scholia.

οὐ δὴ ὁ πατὴρ λέγεται Καρμάνωρ καθῆραι Ἀπόλλωνα. Χρυσοθέμιδος ὕστερον Φιλάμμωνά τε ᾧδῃ μνημονεύουσι νικῆσαι, καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ Θάμυριν τὸν Φιλάμμωνος. Ὀρφεία δὲ σεμνολογία τῇ ἐπὶ τελευταῖς καὶ ὑπὸ φροινήματος τοῦ ἄλλου, καὶ Μουσαῖον τῇ ἐς πάντα μιμήσει τοῦ Ὀρφείως, οὐκ ἐθελήσαί φασιν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ἀγῶνι μουσικῶ ἐξετάζεσθαι<sup>1</sup> —

Ἡ πολλὰ μὲν ζῶν πολλὰ δ' εἰς Αἴδου μολῶν  
Φιλάμμωνος παῖ<sup>m</sup>, τῆς ἐμῆς ἤψω φρενός.  
ὕβρις γὰρ ἦ σ' ἔσφηλε καὶ Μουσῶν ἔρις  
τεκεῖν μ' ἔθηκε τόνδε δύστηνον γόνον.  
περῶσα γὰρ δὴ ποταμίους διὰ ῥοὰς  
λέκτροις ἐπλάθην Στρυμόνος φυταλμίσις,  
ἔτ' ἦλθομεν γῆς χρυσόβωλον ἐς λέπας  
Παγγαῖον ὀργάνοισιν ἐξησηκμένα  
Μοῦσαι, μεγίστην εἰς ἔριν μελωδίας  
δεινῶ σοφιστῇ Θρηκί, κάτυφλώσαμεν  
Θάμυριν, ὅς ἡμῶν πόλλ' ἐδένασεν τέχνην<sup>n</sup>.

Καὶ τοῦδ' Ἀθάνα παντὸς αἰτία μόρου<sup>o</sup>.

καίτοι πόλιν σὴν σύγγονοι πρεσβεύομεν  
Μοῦσαι μάλιστα, κάπιχρώμεθα χθονί.  
μυστηρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φανὰς  
ἔδειξεν Ὀρφεὺς αὐτανέψιος νεκροῦ  
τοῦδ', ὃν κατέκτεινας σὺ Μουσαῖόν τε σὸν  
σεμνὸν πολίτην, κἀπὶ πλείστον ἄνδρ' ἔνα  
ἐλθόντα, Φοῖβος σύγγονοί τ' ἠσκήσαμεν.

Αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸν ἔθηκε καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρας ἔπλασσεν  
πυξίνα ἐν φόρμιγγι Φιλαμμονίδας Εὐμολπος<sup>p</sup>.

De Musis<sup>q</sup>: Hyacinthus, son of Clio and Pierus: Οὐ Θάμυρις ὁ Φιλάμμωνος καὶ Ἀργιόπης Νύμφης ἔσχευ ἔρωτα.... ἀλλ' Ἰάκινθον μὲν ὕστερον Ἀπόλλων.... δίσκῳ βαλὼν ἄκων ἀπέκτεινε. Θάμυρις δὲ.... περὶ μουσικῆς ἤρισε Μούσαις.... καθυπέρτεραι δὲ αἱ Μοῦσαι γειόμεναι καὶ τῶν ὀμμάτων αὐτὸν καὶ τῆς κιθαρωδίας ἐστέρησαν—Ἐρατοῦς δὲ καὶ Ἀεθλίου τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος ἢ Φιλάμμωνος Θάμυρις<sup>r</sup>—Ὁ Θάμυρις δὲ πάλιν παλαιὸς ἦν, ἰσόχρονος Κάδμου,

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias, x. vii. 2.

<sup>m</sup> That is, Thamyris: cf. the Scholia in loc.: also, Conon, *Διήγησις* vii. ap. Phot. Bibl. Cod. 186.

<sup>n</sup> Rhesus, 915 sqq. Terpsichore, matter Rhesi, loquitur.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. 938.

<sup>p</sup> Theocritus, *Idyll.* xxiv. 107. of the teachers of Hercules.

<sup>q</sup> Apollodorus, i. iii. § 3.

<sup>r</sup> Tzetzes, *Scholia in Hesiod. ad Opp.* et Dies, i. pag. 25. of the children of the Muses.

πάππος Ὀρφέως<sup>s</sup>. Ὀρφεὺς δὲ Μειλίππης υἱὸς τῆς Θαμύριδος θυγατρὸς<sup>t</sup>—Thamyris Philammonis (filius) his temporibus fuit (i. e. time of Hercules, and of the labours of Hercules)<sup>v</sup>—Θάμυρις ὁ Φιλάμμωνος ἡκμαζε<sup>x</sup>—Thamyris Ammonis filius insignis habetur<sup>y</sup>.

iv. Παρνησοῦ τάχα δέ<sup>z</sup>: Φιλωνὶς ἢ Δηϊόνος θυγάτηρ οἰκοῦσα τὸν Παρνασσὸν ἐν αὐτῷ παρελέχθη (καὶ Ἐρμῆ) καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι.... εἶτα ἐκ μὲν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος γίνεται Φιλάμμων, ἀνὴρ σοφιστῆς, ὃς καὶ πρῶτος ἐδόκει χοροὺς συστήσασθαι παρθένων· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Ἐρμού Ἀυτόλυκος, ὃς οἰκῶν τὸν Παρνασσὸν πλείστα κλέπτων ἐθησαύριζεν—*Apollinis filii*<sup>a</sup>: Philammon, ex Leuconoë Luciferi filia—*Chione*<sup>b</sup>: Cum Chione, sive ut alii poëtæ dicunt Philonide, Dædalionis filia Apollo et Mercurius una nocte concubuisse dicitur. ea peperit ex Apolline Philammonem, ex Mercurio Autolycum—

Acer erat, belloque ferox, ad vimque paratus,  
Nomine Dædalion; illo genitore creatus,  
Qui vocat Auroram, cœloque novissimus exit.

.. .. .  
Nata erat huic Chione: quæ dotatissima forma  
Mille precis placuit, bis septem nubilis annis.  
Forte revertentes Phœbus, Maiaque creatus,  
Ille suis Delphis, hic vertice Cyllenæo,  
Videre hanc pariter, pariter traxere calorem.

.. .. .  
Alipedis de stirpe dei, versuta propago,  
Nascitur Autolycus, furtum ingeniosus ad omne,

.. .. .  
Nascitur e Phœbo, namque est enixa gemellos,  
Carmine vocali clarus, citharaque Philammon<sup>c</sup>.

### SECTION III.—*Inferences from the preceding Testimonies.*

i. It appears to be only a just and reasonable inference from such statements as these, that tradition among the Greeks must have handed down the memory of an actual person, a celebrated minstrel and poet, one of the same class in his proper order of time as the bards of the heroic age,

<sup>s</sup> Anecdota Græca, Oxon. iii. 376 :  
Schol. ad Alleg. Iliad. A. Τηλέμαχον.

<sup>t</sup> Cf. Dio Chrysost. lxx. 373. 15.

<sup>v</sup> Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. ad  
ann. 772.

<sup>x</sup> Syncellus, 308. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Jerome, Chronicon, ad ann. 767.

<sup>z</sup> Schol. ad Odyss. T. 432.

<sup>a</sup> Hyginus, Fabb. clxi.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. cc.

<sup>c</sup> Ovid, Metam. xi. 294-317.

Demodocus or Phemius, or those of the age before, Musæus, Orpheus, or Linus, or even as Homer and Hesiod in later times—a native or inhabitant of Delphi, called Philammon: to whom also it must have attributed the institution of the Pythian *Chorus*, i. e. of the Pythian games, such as they were at first, an ἀγὼν μουσικὸς, an exhibition and contest of music and song. If so, the traditionary author of the Pythia of classical antiquity must have been this Philammon; for there can be no doubt that even the Pythia of later times grew out of this musical contest at Delphi, and therefore that the founder of the Pythian Chorus and of its proper rule must be regarded as the ultimate author of the Pythia also, properly so called, the second of the games of the Period. We know of no reason why we should doubt of the existence of such a person in his proper order of time; none at least derivable from this fact in his personal history, handed down by tradition, which is the strongest confirmation both of his actual existence and of his actual time. For the founder of the Pythian games must have been as real in his proper order of time as his own institution; and the undoubted antiquity of the Pythia is demonstrative of the equal antiquity of their author.

There is consequently just the same reason to believe that Philammon founded the Pythia, as that Pelops founded the Cronia, Hercules the Olympia, Theseus the Isthmia, or the Seven Chiefs the Nemea: and it is only consistent with what was to be expected *a priori* of the proper end and design of the respective institutions of such different authors, that, while the Cronia, the Olympia, the Isthmia, and the Nemea were martial in their tendency and in their external constitution, and could scarcely have had any object in view but to train and prepare men by means of such games as these for the contests of war, the Pythia, the foundation of a minstrel and a poet, had nothing about them at first of a military character, nothing but what was in harmony with the pursuits and amusements of peace. It is another argument of the real existence of this traditionary author of the Pythian Chorus, that the Nomes, first composed for that chorus, and attributed to him, not only continued to be remembered and known of in subsequent times, but were imitated,

or applied to their own uses and purposes on similar occasions, by musicians of equal or even greater celebrity, and of later date, yet themselves of great antiquity; as, for example, Terpander—of whom this fact is distinctly attested by Plutarch, and whose time went back to B. C. 676 at least<sup>d</sup>. The musical Nomes of Philammon, on this principle, served the same purpose among the Greeks of a perpetual memorial of the personal existence of their author, as the music and songs of the Salii among the Romans in attestation of the personal existence, at an equally remote period, of Numa Pompilius.

ii. It appears also from the preceding statements that tradition, if not from the first, yet in the course of time, had handed down this Philammon, the founder of the Pythian Chorus, as the son of Apollo. And though such a tradition, literally understood, would imply an impossibility, and therefore discredit the fact of the personal existence of Philammon himself in his proper order of time, and would reduce him from an historical character to a fabulous one, in reality this very tradition, rightly understood, is itself the strongest confirmation of his real existence, and makes us aware of another fact in his personal history, the most important and interesting of all, of which nothing would otherwise have been known; viz. that the founder of the Pythian Chorus was the first author also of the worship of the Pythian Apollo; and if of the Pythian Apollo, of the first introduction of the idea, the name, the recognition of the Hellenic Apollo in general.

On this subject we hope to speak more at large by and by. At present, we observe merely that the testimony of antiquity to the personal existence of such and such an individual in his or her proper order of time is not to be set down to the score of fiction, because it begins or ends in an apparent absurdity, viz. that the individual in question was the son or the daughter of a god or a goddess of antiquity. The true explanation of these statements of later times, derived from the traditions of earlier, is an historical fact, the truth of which cannot be called in question; viz. that the gods and goddesses of antiquity every where, and certainly those of

<sup>d</sup> Vide supra, 395.

the Greeks, had a beginning of their existence. There was a time when they had not yet been heard of, and a time after which they were already known by name, and already recognised as divine. And as, under such circumstances, they must have been indebted for their first conception, their first introduction, to some one individual or other; so it was naturally to be expected, (it was, in fact, little less than an inevitable consequence of the relation thus established between themselves and some one individual of the time in question,) that the first author of the worship of a particular divinity would go down to posterity as its son or its daughter. Midas among the Phrygians passed for the son of Kybele, Erichthonius among the Athenians for the son of Athena, Minos among the Cretans for the son of Zeus, Hercules among the rest of the Greeks for the son of Zeus also, Eurytus and Cteatus, the sons of Actor and Molione, for the sons of Posidon, Theseus also for the son of Posidon, Semiramis among the Assyrians for the daughter of Durgha, Iliarbas among the Libyans for the son of the Ammon of Thebes in Egypt—all for this reason, and no other, that each of them in his particular instance, and in his proper order of time, and among his own people and in his own country and within the sphere of his own influence, was the first who proposed, and the first who recognised, the particular object of worship, under its proper name, of which he passed with posterity for the son. It is therefore no objection to the personal existence of Philammon of Delphi, nor to the historical truth of the act traditionally attributed to him, the foundation of the Pythian Chorus, that the same tradition represented him also as the son of the Pythian Apollo. We shall now understand this to mean that he was the author of the worship of this Apollo, as well as of the institution in honour of him; and that as neither the Pythian Chorus, so neither the Pythian Apollo, had any existence before the time of Philammon of Delphi.

iii. And with respect to this time; the date which Eusebius assigns him, (Ad Ann. Abrah. 724, 516 years before Ann. 1240, Olympiad i. 1,) would be B. C. 1292: that of Jerome (Ad Ann. 735) would be B. C. 1281. We can attach no positive assurance to either of these dates. At the best—

they can but approximate to the truth: and as it is much more probable that the chronologers of antiquity in this instance, as in every other of equal remoteness, would err on the side of excess rather than of defect, if they thus concur to date the acme of Philammon in the former half of the thirteenth century before Christ—even that may be presumptively an argument that his time is most probably to be found somewhere in the latter, between B. C. 1250 and 1200.

It is very observable however that in some of these statements he is classed with Linus, Orpheus, and Musæus; and according to Pherkydes in particular he was the companion of the Argonauts, and took part in that expedition, instead of Orpheus: and we have already seen<sup>e</sup> that the date of that expedition could not have gone more than 50 years back before the capture of Troy, B. C. 1230. Many of these testimonies too represent Philammon as the father of Thamyris, (another celebrated minstrel and poet of the Heroic age,) and yet date the acme of Thamyris himself only one generation before the last year of the Trojan war; particularly that of the Rhesus of Sophocles—according to which, Rhesus, the son of Terpsichore, (who could not have been much more than thirty years of age when he came to the assistance of the Trojans in the last year of the war,) was born the year after the contest of the Muses and Thamyris. On this principle, the acme of Thamyris could not have been much more than thirty years before B. C. 1181—that is, than B. C. 1211—and supposing him to have been 30 or 40 years old B. C. 1211, he must have been born between B. C. 1241 and 1251. And if he was the son of Philammon, as many of the above testimonies imply, if *he* was born about B. C. 1241, Philammon might have been born about B. C. 1271, and would not be more than 49 or 50 years of age B. C. 1222—the true date, as we shall see hereafter, of his Pythian institution\*.

\* If the tradition that Thamyris was the son of Philammon could be implicitly relied upon, then the acme of Philammon might be inferred from that of Thamyris; and the acme of Thamyris may be conjectured from the account given of him by Homer. Homer has mentioned Thamyris in his recension of the Pylian contingent, *Iliad*. B. 591–600—

<sup>e</sup> *Supra* 325 sqq.



Οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινὴν  
κ', τ. λ.

καὶ Δώριον, ἔνθα τε Μοῦσαι  
ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς,  
Οἰχαλίθηεν ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος.—  
κ', τ. λ.

Dorion consequently in Pylus was the scene of this supposed contest between Thamyris and the Muses; and according to some of the ancients (Eustathius in loc. 297. 37.) it was so called because the Dorian mode in music was invented there by Thamyris, and we may presume on this very occasion. But the observable circumstance in this account is, that he was coming from Œchalia at the time, and from Eurytus the Œchalian; which proves that he was a contemporary of this Eurytus, whosoever he was, and probably his bard or minstrel, like Demodocus at the court of Alkinous, or Phemius, the bard of Ulysses. Homer has mentioned this Eurytus again, Odys. Θ. 224—

Οὔτ' Εὐρύτῳ Οἰχαλιῆϊ—

which proves that he was the person so called, whom tradition had handed down as a celebrated archer, and superior to all in his time, or after his time, in the use of the bow. And that does much to identify him with Eurytus the contemporary of Hercules, and according to Theocritus, Idyll. xxiv. 105, the instructor of Hercules himself in the use of the bow.

Eustathius (loc. cit. 298. 20 sqq.) tells us the ancients enumerated many places of the name of Œchalia. Cf. Strabo, viii. 3. 147 a, and Steph. Byz. Οἰχαλία. But Homer has mentioned only one; and that in his account of the forces from Thessaly, under the two sons of Æsculapius—Ibid. B. 730.

Οἳ τ' ἔχον Οἰχαλίην πόλιν Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος.

His Eurytus therefore, and consequently the Eurytus of Thamyris, was a Thessalian, and the king of Œchalia in Thessaly.

Now the traditionary account of the life and labours of Hercules having invariably represented the last of his adventures to have been the capture of this Œchalia, and the destruction of this Eurytus, its king, and all his family, excepting Iöle his daughter, yet followed immediately after by the death of Hercules himself, if the date of the death of Hercules was B. C. 1208, (see supra 550,) that of Eurytus must have been so too. The contest of the Muses and Thamyris therefore could not be dated later than B. C. 1208. Let us suppose it happened at that time, and that Thamyris was then in his acme, and about 35: on this principle he must have been born about B. C. 1243, when Philammon, if he was really his father, might not be more than 30. We have seen too (supra page 462 n.) that according to tradition, Thamyris was the ἐραστὴς of Hyakinthus—from which we inferred that probably he was not much older than Hyakinthus. If he was born about B. C. 1243, he would be 21 or 22 years old B. C. 1222, when Hyakinthus, as we conjectured, might be 15 or 16.

It is also to be observed, that those who represent Philammon as the son of Apollo, but by Chione the daughter of Deucalion, or Dædalion, make him the twin brother of Autolycus, born at the same time with him, but the son of Chione and Hermes. The foundation of this account of the parentage and birth of both these characters was probably *this* coincidence in the personal history of each; that while the worship of Apollo was introduced among the Greeks of Delphi, Parnassus, or Phocis, by Philammon, the worship of Hermes (which probably first came into being in a different part of Greece, mount Kyllene in Arcadia) was introduced in the same quarter, and about the same time, by Autolycus. But be this as it may; the twin brother of Philammon, according to this tradition, was the father of Anticlea, (the wife of Laertes.) and the grandfather of Ulysses. On this principle, Autolycus might not have been more than 44 or 45 years old at the birth of Ulysses, nor consequently Philammon. And if Ulysses was about 45 years old in the last year of the Trojan war, and consequently born about B.C. 1226, Autolycus and Philammon might have been born B.C. 1270 or 1271. We can place no certain reliance indeed on the tradition that Autolycus was the brother of Philammon; but we may infer from this tradition itself, that he and Autolycus were known to have been contemporaries. And as both were natives or inhabitants of mount Parnassus, or its vicinity in general, it is not improbable that each might have concurred with the other; the one in introducing the worship of Apollo, the other that of Hermes, in the same quarter, and about the same time: which would account for their descending to posterity, the one as the son of Apollo, the other as the son of Hermes, and in this peculiar relation to each other of twin brothers, by different fathers, but the same mother.

SECTION IV.—*On the Fable of the Pytho; of the Pythian Apollo; and of the Pythian Oracle. Testimonies.*

- i. Proxima vipereo celebravit libera nexu  
Phocis, Apollinæ bellum juvenile pharetræ †.

---

† Statius, Thebais, vi. 8.

Illa quidem nollet, sed te quoque maxime Python  
 Tunc genuit; populisque novis, incognita serpens,  
 Terror eras: tantum spatii de monte tenebas.  
 Hanc deus arcitenens, et nunquam talibus armis  
 Ante nisi in damis capreisque fugacibus usus,  
 Mille gravem telis, exhausta pæne pharetra  
 Perdidit, effuso per vulnera nigra veneno.  
 Neve operis famam possit delere vetustas,  
 Instituit sacros celebri certamine ludos,  
 Pythia, de domitæ serpentis nomine dictos.  
 His juvenum quicumque manu pedibusve rotave  
 Vicerat, æsculeæ capiebat frondis honorem.  
 Nondum laurus erat, longoque decentia crine  
 Tempora cingebat de qualibet arbore Phæbus §.

Ex Demogorgone et terra (natus) Python, draco divinus<sup>h</sup>—  
 Ibi (sc. at Ortygia or Delos) Latona oleam tenens parit  
 Apollinem et Dianam: quibus Vulcanus sagittas dedit do-  
 num. post diem quartum quam essent nati Apollo matris  
 pœnas exsecutus est. nam Parnassum venit, et Pythonem  
 sagittis interfecit: inde Pythius est dictus. ossaque ejus in  
 cortinam coniecit, et in templo suo posuit, ludosque funebres  
 ei fecit, qui Ludi Pythia dicuntur<sup>i</sup>—'Ο τῶν Πυθίων ἀγῶν  
 ἐτέθη μὲν πρότερος τῶν Ἰσθμίων πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ... ἔρχεται τοίνυν  
 εἰς Δελφοὺς ὁ Ἀπόλλων Πυθῶνι τὰς βοῦς νέμων...καὶ ἀποκτείνας  
 τὸν ὄφιν τὸν Πυθῶνα, ἀγωνίζεται τὸν Πυθικὸν ἀγῶνα...οὕτω μὲν  
 οὖν κατέστη πρῶτον ὁ τῶν Πυθίων ἀγῶν. οἱ δὲ τὸν γυμνικὸν  
 ἀγῶνα νικήσαντές εἰσιν οἶδε, ὅτε Ἀπόλλων ἔθηκε Πύθια ἐν τῷ τοῦ  
 Πυθῶνος ἀγῶνι. Κάστωρ στάδιον, πύξ Πολυδεύκης, δόλιχον Κά-  
 λαῖς, ὀπλίτην Ζήτης, δίσκου Πηλεὺς, πάλην Τελαμῶν, παγκράτιον  
 Ἡρακλῆς· οὗς τῷ φυτῷ τῆς δάφνης ἐστεφάνωσεν<sup>k</sup>—*De Lydia  
 Harmonia*<sup>l</sup>: 'Ἐπειδὴ ὀξεία καὶ ἐπιτήδειος πρὸς θρήνον· ἧ καὶ τὴν  
 πρῶτην σύστασιν αὐτῆς φασὶ θρηνώδη τινα γενέσθαι."Ολυμπον γὰρ  
 πρῶτον Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τῷ περὶ Μουσικῆς ἐπὶ τῷ Πύθωνί φησιν  
 ἐπικηδεῖον αὐλῆσαι Λυδιστί.

- ii. Καλὸν Ἰηπαιῖον Ἰηπαιῖονα Φοῖβον  
 μελπόμενοι· σὺν δέ σφιν εἰς πάϊς Οἰάγροιο  
 Βιστονίη φόρμιγγι λιγείης ἤρχεν ἀοιδῆς·  
 ὡς ποτε πετραίης ὑπὸ δειράσι Παρνησσοῖο  
 Δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριξεν

§ Ovid. *Metam.* i. 438.

<sup>h</sup> Hyginus, *Fabb.* i.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* cxl. Python.

<sup>k</sup> *Argumentum Pythium Primum.*

<sup>l</sup> Plutarch, *De Musica*, xv.

κοῦρος ἔων ἔτι γυμνός, ἔτι πλοκάμοισι γεγηθώς.

πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκῖαι Νύμφαι, Πλείστοιο θύγατραι,  
 θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, Ἴηϊε κεκληγγυῖαι·  
 ἔνθεν δὴ τότε καλὸν ἐφύμιον ἔπλετο Φοῖβον<sup>m</sup>.

—Τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ δράκοντος οἱ μὲν ἀρσενικῶς, οἱ δὲ θηλυκῶς εἶπον, ὃ καὶ βέλτιον.... ὅτι Δελφύνης ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ φυλάσσων τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς χρηστήριον Νέαυδρος καὶ Καλλίμαχος εἶπεν. δράκαιναν δὲ αὐτὴν φησιν εἶναι θηλυκῶς καλουμένην Δελφύνην αὐτὸς ὁ Καλλίμαχος<sup>n</sup>.

Ἴη ἰὴ Παιῶν ἀκούομεν· οὐνεκα τοῦτο  
 Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμιον εὔρετο λαὸς,  
 ἦμος ἐκηβολίην χρυσέων ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων.  
 Πυθῶ τοι κατιόντι συνήντετο δαιμόνιος θῆρ,  
 αἰνὸς ὄφει, τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες, ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλω  
 βάλλων ὠκὺν οἴστον· ἐπητύτησε δὲ λαὸς  
 ἰὴ ἰὴ Παιῶν, ἔει βέλος· εὐθύ σε μήτηρ  
 γείνατ' ἀοσσητήρα. τὸ δ' ἐξέτι κείθεν αἰεῖδη<sup>o</sup>.

Ἵοπότη ἰὴ Παιῶν ἰὴ Παιῶν ἀκούσῃ<sup>p</sup>.

Οὔπω μοι Πυθῶνι μέλει τριποδῆϊος ἔδρη,  
 οὐδέ τί πω τέθνηκεν ὄφει μέγας· ἀλλ' ἔτι κείνο  
 θηρίον αἰνογένειον ἀπὸ Πλειστοῖο καθέρπον  
 Παρνησὸν νιφύοντα περιστέφει ἐννέα κύκλοις<sup>q</sup>.

Τῷ πάρα Πυθῶνος θυόεν πεδὸν, ἦχι δράκοντος  
 Δελφύνης τριπόδεσσι θεοῦ παρακέκλιται ὄλκος,  
 ὄλκος ἀπειρεσίησιν ἐπιφρίσσων φολίδεσσι  
 νηῶ ἐν ἱμερτῶ κ', τ. λ.<sup>r</sup>

"Οθεν τότε Κάδμος ὀδεύων

ἱερὸν ἔδρακε χῶρον ἐπόψιον, ἦχι νοήσας  
 Πύθιος ἐννεάκυκλον ὀρειάδος ὄλκον ἀκάνθης  
 εὔνασε Κιρραῖης θανατηφόρον ἰὸν ἐχίδνης<sup>s</sup>.

Δελφύνην δ' ἐδάμασσε καὶ αἰθέρα ναῖεν Ἀπόλλων<sup>t</sup>.

Εὔπαις ὁ Λατοῦς γόνος,  
 ὅν ποτε Δηλιάς ἐν  
 καρποφόροις γυάλοις  
 Φοῖβον τὸν χρυσοκόμαν  
 ἐν κιθάρα σοφὸν, ἄ τ' ἐπὶ τόξων  
 εὐστοχία γάνυται,

<sup>m</sup> Apollonius Rhod. ii. 704.

<sup>n</sup> Scholia in loco.

<sup>o</sup> Callimachus, Hymn. in Apollin.

97. cf. Scholia in Aristoph. Pax, 452.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. 21.

<sup>q</sup> Hymnus in Delum, 90.

<sup>r</sup> Dionysius Perieg. 441. cf. Eustathius in loc.

<sup>s</sup> Nonnus, iv. 315.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. xiii. 28.

φέρειν ἴνιν ἀπὸ δειράδος εἰναλίας,  
 λοχεΐα κλεινὰ λιπούσα  
 ἀστάκτων μάτηρ ὑδάτων,  
 τὰν βακχεύουσαν Διονύ-  
 σῳ Παρνάσιον κορυφᾶν,  
 ὅθι ποικιλόνωτος οἰνωπὸς δράκων  
 σκιερᾶ κατάχαλκος εὐφύλλῳ δάφνῳ,  
 γᾶς πελώριον τέρας, ἄμφεπε  
 \* \* \* μαντεῖον χθόνιον.  
 ἔτι μιν ἔτι βρέφος, ἔτι φίλας  
 ἐπὶ ματέρος ἀγκάλαισι θρώσκων  
 ἔκανες, ὦ Φοῖβε, μαντεῖον δ' ἐπέβας ζαθέων.  
 τρίποδι τ' ἐν χρυσεῷ θάσσεις, ἐν ἀψευδεῖ θρόνῳ,  
 μαντείας βροτοῖς  
 θεσφάτων νέμων  
 ἀδύτων ὕπο, Κασταλίας ρέεθρων  
 γείτων, μέσον γᾶς ἔχων μέλαθρον ὕ.

iii. Ζάθεά τ' ἄντρα δράκοντος<sup>x</sup>: Σπήλαιόν ἐστιν ἐν τῷ Παρ-  
 ριασῶν δράκοντος, ὃν ἀνεῖλεν Ἀπόλλων, καὶ τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ παρὰ  
 τὸν ναὸν εἴρηται (ἠώρηται), τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ παριστῶν νίκην. λέγουσι  
 δὲ καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν οὕτω παρωνομάσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖ κατασαπέντος  
 δράκοντος· τὸ πύθω γὰρ τὸ σήπω<sup>y</sup>. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πεύθω, τὸ ἐρωτῶ  
 καὶ μαθάνω, φασίν, ἅτε κοινὸν χρηστήριον πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις οὔσαν,  
 ἐρωτῶσι περὶ ᾧ βούλονται καὶ μαθάνουσι. ἦν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ  
 δράκοντος Δελφίνης· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ τόπος τὸ ὄνομα ἔσχε, Δελφοὶ κα-  
 λούμενος—Δελφύς...μήτρα καὶ ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς δράκων<sup>z</sup>—Ἀπόλλων  
 δὲ τὴν μαντικὴν μαθὼν παρὰ τοῦ Πανὸς τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Οὐμβρεως  
 ἦκεν εἰς Δελφοὺς, χρησμοφδοῦσης τότε Θέμιδος. ὥς δὲ ὁ φρουρῶν  
 τὸ μαντεῖον Πύθων ὄφεις ἐκώλυεν αὐτὸν παρελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ χάσμα,  
 τοῦτον ἀνελὼν τὸ μαντεῖον παραλαμβάνει<sup>a</sup>—Ὑποβὰς δὲ (scil. ὁ  
 Ἔφορος) περὶ τῶν Δελφῶν οἴτινές εἰσι διαλεγόμενος, φησὶ τὸ  
 παλαιὸν Παρνασίους τινὰς ἀντόχθοινας καλουμένους οἰκεῖν τὸν  
 Παρνασόν· καθ' ὃν χρόνον τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα τὴν γῆν ἐπιόντα ἡμε-  
 ροῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ τε τῶν ἀνημέρων καρπῶν καὶ τῶν βίων.  
 ἐξ Ἀθηναίων δ' ὀρμηθέντα ἐπὶ Δελφοὺς ταύτην ἰέναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἧ νῦν  
 Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν Πυθιάδα πέμπουσι. γενόμενον δὲ κατὰ Πανοπέας,  
 Τιτυὸν καταλῦσαι, ἔχοντα τὸν τόπον, βίαιον ἄνδρα καὶ παράνομον.  
 τοὺς δὲ Παρνασίους συμμίξαντας αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλον μινῦσαι χαλεπὸν

<sup>v</sup> Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*,  
 1234 sqq.

<sup>x</sup> Scholia in *Phoenissas*, 232.

<sup>y</sup> Hesychius, Πύθεται· σήπεται, βρέ-  
 χεται. cf. *Iliad*. A. 395 : *Odysseus*. A. 161.

and the Schol.: also the *Etym. M.* in  
 Πύθω.

<sup>z</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>a</sup> Apollodorus, i. iv. 1.

ἄνδρα, Πύθωνα τοῦνομα ἐπὶ κλήσιν δὲ δράκοντα· κατατοξεύοντος δὲ ἐπικελεύειν Ἰε Παιάν· ἀφ' οὗ τὸν παιανισμὸν οὕτως ἐξ ἔθους παραδοθῆναι τοῖς μέλλουσι συμπίπτειν εἰς παράταξιν. ἐμπρησθῆναι δὲ καὶ σκηρῆν τότε τοῦ Πύθωνος ὑπὸ τῶν Δελφῶν, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν ἔτι καὶ ἀεὶ, ὑπόμνημα ποιουμένων τῶν τότε γενομένων<sup>b</sup>—Πύθωνα<sup>c</sup> καὶ αὕτη πόλις Φωκίδος. τὸ πρότερον δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο Παρνασσία Νάπη, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου ὄρους· ἔπειτα Πυθῶν, ὕστερον δὲ Δελφοί. καὶ Πυθῶ μὲν, ἐπεὶ κατεσάπη αὐτόθι ὁ δράκων, ὁ τὸ μαντεῖον πρότερον φυλάττων, ὃν ἀπέκτεινε τοξεύσας ὁ Ἀπόλλων—Τοξίου βουνός. τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Σικυῶνι<sup>d</sup>. βέλτιον δὲ ἀκούειν τὴν ἐν Δελφοῖς Νάπην λεγομένην. ἐκεῖ γὰρ καὶ ὁ δράκων κατετοξεύθη, καὶ ὁ ὄμφαλὸς τῆς γῆς τάφος ἐστὶ τοῦ Πυθῶνος<sup>e</sup>—Χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον καὶ Πυθῶ τὴν πόλιν, οὐ Δελφοὺς μόνον, ἐκάλεσαν οἱ περιουκῶντες· καθὰ καὶ Ὅμηρῳ πεποιημένα ἐν καταλόγῳ Φωκέων ἐστὶν ... λόγος δὲ ὃς ἤκει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς, τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοξευθέντα σήπασθαι φησὶν ἐνταῦθα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα τῇ πόλει γενέσθαι Πυθῶ. πύθεσθαι γὰρ δὴ τὰ σηπόμενα οἱ τότε ἔλεγον... τὸν δὲ ἀποθανόντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ποιηταὶ μὲν δράκοντα εἶναι, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ μαντεῖφ φύλακα ὑπὸ Γῆς ταχθῆναι φασί<sup>f</sup>—

Ἄγχοῦ δὲ κρήνη Καλλίρροος ἔνθα δράκαιναν  
κτείνειν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς ἀπὸ κρατεροῖο βιοῖο,  
ζατρεφέα μεγάλην τέρας ἄγριον, ἣ κακὰ πολλὰ  
ἀνθρώπους ἐρδέσκειν ἐπὶ χθονί, πολλὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς  
πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα ταναῦποδ', ἐπεὶ πέλε πῆμα δαφονόν<sup>g</sup>.

Πρὶν γέ οἱ ἰὼν ἐφήκεν ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων  
καρτερόν· ἣ δ' οὐδύνησιν ἐρεχθομένη χαλεπήσιν  
κείτο μεγ' ἀσθμαίνουσα, κυλινδομένη κατὰ χῶρον.  
θεσπεσίη δ' ἐνοπὴ γένητ' ἄσπετος. ἣ δὲ καθ' ἕλην  
πυκνὰ μάλ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσεται, λείπε δὲ θυμὸν,  
φειδὼν ἀποπνεύουσα· ὁ δ' ἐπηύξατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων·  
Ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν Πύθου ἐπὶ χθονί βωτιανείρη—  
—ἀλλὰ σέ γ' αὐτοῦ,  
Πύσει γαῖα μέλαινα καὶ ἠλέκτωρ Ὑπερίων.  
ὥς φατ' ἐπευχόμενος· τὴν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψεν,  
τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ κατέπυσ' ἱερὸν μένος ἠελίοιο.  
ἐξ οὗ νῦν Πυθῶ κικλήσκειται· οἱ δὲ ἄνακτα  
Πύθιον καλέουσιν ἐπώνυμον, οὐνεκα κείθι  
αὐτοῦ Πύσε πέλωρ μένος ὀξέος ἠελίοιο<sup>h</sup>—

<sup>b</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 282, 283. From Ephorus.

<sup>c</sup> Schol. ad Il. B. 519.

<sup>d</sup> Cf. Aristoteles, Περὶ θαυμασίων ἀκουσμάτων, 58.

<sup>e</sup> Hesychius.

<sup>f</sup> Pausanias, x. vi. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Hymnus in Apollinem, 300.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. 357.

Τῷ δ' ἀποκτείναντι μήτ' ἐννέα ἔτων μήτ' εἰς τὰ Τέμπη γενέσθαι τὴν φυγὴν, ἀλλ' ἐκπεσόντα ἔλθειν εἰς ἕτερον κόσμον ὕστερον δ' ἐκείθεν, ἐνιαυτῶν μεγάλων ἐννέα περιόδοις ἄγνόν γεγόμενον καὶ Φοῖβον ἀληθῶς, κατελθόντα τὸ χρηστήριον παραλαβεῖν, τέως ὑπὸ Θέμιδος φυλαττόμενον<sup>i</sup>—Ἀλεξανδρίδης δὲ ὁ Δελφός φησι θητεῦσαι αὐτὸν (scil. τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα) διότι τὸν Πυθοῖ δράκοντα ἀνείλεν<sup>k</sup>.

iv. Ἀρχαιότατον δὲ ἀγώνισμα γενέσθαι μνημονεύουσι, καὶ ἐφ' ᾧ πρῶτον ἄθλα ἔθεσαν, ἧσαι ὕμνον ἐς τὸν θεόν. καὶ ἦσε καὶ ἐνίκησεν ἄδων Χρυσόθεμις ἐκ Κρήτης, οὗ δὴ ὁ πατὴρ λέγεται Καρμάνωρ καθῆραι Ἀπόλλωνα<sup>l</sup>—Καὶ ἀποκτείνας τὸν ὄφιν τὸν Πύθωνα ἀγωνίζεται τὸν Πυθικὸν ἀγῶνα.... πείραν μὲν, ὅτι ἀπεπειράθη τῆς κατὰ τὸ θηρίον μάχης· ἴαμβον δὲ, διὰ τὴν λοιδορίαν τὴν γενομένην αὐτῇ πρὸ τῆς μάχης· λέγεται γὰρ ἰαμβίζειν τὸ λοιδορεῖν· δάκτυλοι δὲ, ἀπὸ Διονύσου, ὅτι πρῶτος οὗτος δοκεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος θεμιστεῦσαι (and in Dactylic verse)· Κρητικὸν δὲ, ἀπὸ Διός· Μητρώων δὲ, ὅτι γῆς ἐστὶ τὸ μαιτεῖον· σύριγμα δὲ, διὰ τὸν τοῦ ὄφεως συριγμόν. οὕτω μὲν οὖν κατέστη πρῶτον ὁ τῶν Πυθίων ἀγών<sup>m</sup>—Τὰ Πύθια ἐτέθη, ὡς μὲν τινες, ἐπὶ τῷ δράκοντι, ὃν φύλακα ὄντα τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς μαιτείου ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἔκτειεν. ἐκλήθη δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου· τῷ δὲ τόπῳ ἦν τὸ ὄνομα Πυθῶ, ἧτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦς φοιτῶντας ἐπὶ τὸ μαιτεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ πυθθάνεσθαι, ἢ διὰ τὸ σαπῆναι τὸ θηρίον αὐτόθι ἀναιρεθέν. πύθεσθαι γάρ ἐστὶ τὸ σίπασθαι. ὡς παρ' Ὀμήρῳ,

Λεύκ' ὄστ' ἐὰ πύθεται ὄμβρον<sup>n</sup>.

καθαρθεῖς δὲ ὁ Ἀπόλλων τὸν τῆς δρακοιτοκτονίας φόνον ἐν Κρήτῃ παρὰ Χρυσοθέμιδι, ἐκείθεν ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὰ Θετταλικά Τέμπη, ἐνθεῖ μετεκομίσαστο τὴν δάφην. μέχρι δὲ πολλοῦ ἢ εἰς τοὺς τῶν νικῶντων στεφάνους χωροῦσα δάφνη ἐντεῦθεν ἐκομίζετο ὑπὸ παιδὸς ἀμφιθαλοῦς<sup>o</sup>—Ἀγῶνι δὲ ὁ μὲν ἀρχαῖος ἐν Δελφοῖς κιθαρωδῶν ἐγενήθη, παιᾶνα ἄδόντων εἰς τὸν θεόν· ἔθηκαν δὲ Δελφοί. μετὰ δὲ τὸν Κρισσαῖον πόλεμον οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες ἰππικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπ' Εὐρυλόχου διέταξαν στεφανίτην, καὶ Πύθια ἐκάλεσαν. προσέθησαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρωδοῖς ἀυλητάς τε καὶ κιθαριστάς χωρὶς ψῆδης, ἀποδώσουντάς τι μέλος ὃ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός. πέντε δ' αὐτοῦ μέρη ἐστίν, ἀνάκρουσις, ἄμπειρα, κατακελευσμός, ἴαμβοι, καὶ δάκτυλοι, (δάκτυλοι καὶ) σύριγγες. ἐμελοποίησε μὲν οὖν Τιμοσθένης ὁ ναύαρχος τοῦ δευτέρου

<sup>i</sup> Plutarch, De Defectu Oraculorum, xxi.

<sup>k</sup> Scholia in Alkestin, ad vers. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Pausanias, x. vii. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Argumentum Pythium primum : cf. Scholia ad Pythia i. Πινδάρου Πύθια.

<sup>n</sup> Odyss. A. 161.

<sup>o</sup> Argumentum Tertium.

Πτολεμαίου, ὁ καὶ τοὺς λιμένας συντάξας ἐν δέκα βίβλοις. βούλεται δὲ τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν πρὸς τὸν δράκοντα διὰ τοῦ μέλους ὑμνεῖν· ἀνάκρουσιν μὲν τὸ προοίμιον δηλῶν· ἄμπειραν δὲ τὴν πρῶτην κατὰπειραν τοῦ ἀγῶνος· κατακελευσμὸν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν ἀγῶνα· ἱαμβον δὲ καὶ δάκτυλον τὸν ἐπιπαιωνισμὸν τὸν γινόμενον ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ, μετὰ τοιούτων ῥυθμῶν ὧν ὁ μὲν ὕμνοις οἰκειὸς ἐστίν, ὁ δ' ἱαμβος κακισμοῖς, καὶ τὸ ἱαμβίζειν· σύριγγες δὲ τὴν ἔκλειψιν τοῦ θηρίου μιμουμένων, ὡς ἂν καταστρέφοντος εἰς ἐσχάτους τινὰς συριγμούς P.

v. Τίς ἢ παρὰ Δελφοῖς Χαρίλα; Τρεῖς ἄγουσι Δελφοὶ ἐνναετηρίδας κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς, ὧν τὴν μὲν Σεπτήριον καλοῦσι, τὴν δ' Ἑρωΐδα, τὴν δὲ Χαρίλαν. τὸ μὲν οὖν Σεπτήριον ἔοικε μίμημα τῆς πρὸς τὸν Πύθωνα τοῦ θεοῦ μάχης εἶναι, καὶ τῆς μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐπὶ τὰ Τέμπη φυγῆς καὶ ἐκδιώξεως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ φυγεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ φόνῳ φασί, χρήζοντα καθαρσίων, οἱ δὲ τῷ Πύθωνι, τετρωμένῳ καὶ φεύγοντι, κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν νῦν ἱερὰν καλοῦμεν ἐπακολουθεῖν, καὶ μικρὸν ἀπολειφθῆναι τῆς τελευτῆς. κατέλαβε γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος ἄρτι τεθηκότα, κекηδευμένον (δὲ) ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Αἰξ, ὡς λέγουσι. τὸ μὲν οὖν Σεπτήριον τούτων ἢ τοιούτων τινῶν ἀπομίμησις ἐστίν ἐτέρων. τῆς δὲ Ἑρωΐδος τὰ πλεῖστα μουσικὸν (μυστικὸν) ἔχει λόγον, ὃν ἴσασι αἱ Θυιάδες, ἐκ δὲ τῶν δρωμένων φανερώς Σεμέλης ἂν τις ἀναγωγὴν (bringing up, or back) εἰκάσειε. περὶ δὲ τῆς Χαρίλας, τοιαυτὰ τινα μυθολογοῦσι. λιμὸς ἐξ αὐχμοῦ τοὺς Δελφοὺς κατέσχε, καὶ πρὸς τὰς θύρας τοῦ βασιλέως ἐλθόντες μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν ἰκέτευσον κ', τ. λ. ἐλθούσης δὲ παιδὸς ἔτι μικρᾶς ὄρφανῆς γουέων κ', τ. λ. ἀνείλεν ἢ Πυθία τῷ βασιλεῖ Χαρίλαν ἰλάσκεσθαι παρθένον αὐτοθάνατον. μόλις οὖν ἀνευρόντες ὅτι τοῦνομα τοῦτ' ἦν τῇ ραπισθείσῃ παιδί, μεμιγμένην τινὰ καθαρμῷ θυσίαν ἀπετέλεσαν, ἣν ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἔτι καὶ νῦν δι' ἐννέα ἐτῶν κ', τ. λ. 9—Πλεῖστον δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας διαμαρτάνουσιν οἱ Δελφῶν θεολόγοι, νομίζοντες ἐνταυθα ποτε πρὸς ὄφιν τῷ θεῷ περὶ τοῦ χρηστηρίου μάχην γενέσθαι, καὶ ταῦτα ποιητὰς καὶ λογογράφους ἐν θεάτροις ἀγωνιζομένους λέγειν ἐῶντες, ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες ἀντιμαρτυροῦντας ὧν δρῶσιν ἱεροῖς ἀγιωτάτοις. θαυμάσαντος δὲ τοῦ Φιλίππου (παρῆν γὰρ ὁ συγγραφεὺς) καὶ πυθομένοις τίσιν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖν ἱεροῖς οἴεται τοὺς ἀνταγωνιζομένους; Τούτοις, ἔφη, τοῖς περὶ τὸ χρηστήριον, οἷς ἄρτι τοὺς ἔξω Πυλῶν πάντας Ἑλληνας ἢ πόλις κατοργιάζουσα μέχρι Τεμπῶν ἐλήλακεν. ἢ τε γὰρ ἰσταμένη καλιὰς ἐνταῦθα περὶ τὴν ἄλω δι' ἐννέα ἐτῶν, οὐ φωλεώδης τοῦ δράκοντος χειὰ, ἀλλὰ μίμημα τυραννικῆς ἢ βασιλικῆς ἐστὶν οἰκήσεως· ἢ τε μετὰ σιγῆς ἐπ' αὐτὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομα-



ζομένης Δολωνείας ἔφοδος, μὴ αἰόλα δὲ (corrupt, lege ἢ τὸν) ἀμφιθαλῆ κόρον ἡμμέραις δαφῶν ἄγονσι, καὶ προσβάλλοντες τὸ πῦρ τῆ καλιάδι, καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἀνατρέψαιτες, ἀνεπιστρεπτὲ φεύγουσι διὰ τῶν θυρῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τελευταίου αἶ τε πλάναί καὶ ἡ λατρεία τοῦ παιδός, οἷ τε γινόμενοι περὶ τὰ Τέμπη καθαρμοὶ, μεγάλου τιγὸς ἄγους καὶ τολμήματος ὑποψίαν ἔχουσι<sup>†</sup>—Ποιηθῆναι δὲ τὸν ναὸν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὸ ἀρχαιότατον δάφνης φασί, κομισθῆναι δὲ τοὺς κλάδους ἀπὸ τῆς δάφνης τῆς ἐν τοῖς Τέμπεσι καλύβης ἧ ἂν σχῆμα οὕτως γε ἂν εἴη παρεσχηματισμένος ὁ ναός<sup>‡</sup>—

\* Ἡ κατὰ Πηνειῷ κατὰ Τέμπεα ἢ κατὰ Πίνδω<sup>†</sup>;

Τέμπη δὲ γενικῶς μὲν τὰ ἄλλα· ἢ δὲ τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς Ὀσσης καὶ τοῦ Ὀλύμπου χωρίον, ὃ ἐστὶ περικαλλές, καὶ ὡσπερ ὑπὸ θείας γνώμης πρὸς διόρτυξιν διηρημένον, δι' ἧς ὁ Πηνειὸς πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν ῥεῖ. λέγεται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον Τέμπεα Θετταλικά<sup>†</sup>—Δαυρεία ἢ ἐν τοῖς Τέμπεσι δάφνη· τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ Δήλεια<sup>‡</sup>—Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τῷ κατακομίζοντι παιδὶ τὴν Τεμπικὴν δάφνην εἰς Δελφούς παρομαρτεῖ ἀληθῆς<sup>‡</sup>—Ἰόντες δὲ οἱ Δόλογοι τὴν ἱρὴν ὁδὸν διὰ Φωκῶν τε καὶ Βοιωτίων ἦνταν<sup>‡</sup>—Δειπνῶς· κώμη Θεσσαλίας περὶ Λάρισσαν, ὅπου φασὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα δειπνῆσαι πρῶτον, ὅτε ἐκ τῶν Τεμπέων καθαρθεὶς ὑπέστρεψε, καὶ τῷ παιδὶ, τῷ διακομιστῇ τῆς δάφνης, ἔθος εἰς τήνδε παραγενομένῳ δειπνεῖν<sup>‡</sup>.

vi. Ἐστὶ δὴ χάρος μεταξὺ κείμενος τοῦ τε Ὀλύμπου καὶ τῆς Ὀσσης· ὄρη δὲ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ὑπερύψηλα, καὶ οἶον ὑπὸ τιος θείας φροντίδος διεσχισμένα. καὶ μέσον δέχεται (lege δὲ κεῖται) χωρίον οὗ τὸ μὲν μήκος ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοιτα διήκει σταδίους, τό γε μὴν πλάτος τῆ μὲν ἐστὶ πλῆθρον τῆ δὲ καὶ πλείον ὀλίγω· διαρρεῖ δὲ μέσον αὐτοῦ ὁ καλούμενος Πηνειὸς κ', τ. λ.

Ἐνταῦθά τοί φασὶ παῖδες Θετταλῶν καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα τὸν Πύθιον καθήρασθαι κατὰ πρόσταγμα τοῦ Διός, ὅτε τὸν Πύθωνα τὸν δράκοντα κατετόξευεν ἔτι φυλάττοντα τοὺς Δελφούς, τῆς Γῆς ἐχούσης τὸ μαντεῖον. στεφανωσάμενοι οὖν ἐκ ταύτης τῆς δάφνης τῆς Τεμπικῆς, λαβόντα κλάδον εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν χεῖρα ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς δάφνης, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Δελφούς καὶ παραλαβεῖν τὸ μαντεῖον τὸν Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς παῖδα. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ βωμὸς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τόπῳ ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστεφανώσατο καὶ τὸν κλάδον ἀφείλε. καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἔτους ἐννάτου

† Plutarch, De Oraculorum defectu, xiv.

‡ Pausanias, x. v. 5.

† Theocritus, Idyll. i. 67.

‡ Schol. in loc.

x Hesychius. cf. in Δελία (Δηλία) δάφνη.

y Plutarch, De Musica, xiv.

z Herodotus, vi 34.

a Stephanus Byz.

οἱ Δελφοὶ παῖδας εὐγενεῖς πέμπουσι, καὶ ἀρχιθέωρον ἕνα σφῶν αὐτῶν· οἱ δὲ παραγερόμενοι καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς θύσαντες ἐν τοῖς Τέμπεσιν ἀπίασι πάλιν, στεφάνους ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς δάφνης διαπλέξαντες, ἀφ' ἧσπερ ἔρων καὶ τότε ὁ θεὸς ἑστεφανώσατο. καὶ τὴν ὕδὸν ἐκείνην ἔρχονται, ἣ καλεῖται μὲν Πυθιάς φέρει δὲ διὰ Θετταλίας καὶ Πελαγονίας, καὶ τῆς Οὔτης καὶ Αἰνιάνων χώρας, καὶ τῆς Μηλιέων καὶ Δωριέων καὶ Λοκρῶν τῶν ἑσπερίων. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ παραπέμπουσιν αὐτοὺς σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ τιμῇ, οὐδὲν ἦττον ἤπερ οὖν ἐκείνοι οἱ τοὺς ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων τὰ ἱερὰ κομίζοντας τῷ αὐτῷ θεῷ τούτῳ τιμῶσιν. καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῖς Πυθίοις ἐκ ταύτης τῆς δάφνης τοῖς νικῶσι τοὺς στεφάνους διδόνασιν<sup>b</sup>.

SECTION V.—*Observations upon the preceding Testimonies, and inferences from them.*

i. Final end of the Pythian Fable.

Though the preceding statements are the testimonies of comparatively late authorities, and none of them professes to be a formal account of the Pythian institution, yet, as they evidently comprehend the oldest and most characteristic circumstances of the tradition relating to that subject, laying them together and reasoning from them collectively, we may form a consistent idea of the final end of the Pythian fable, and of the nature, coherency, and joint result of its circumstances, as accommodated from the first to a particular end and purpose.

i. The foundation of this fable must have been a supposed contest between two persons, for a certain object; and *those* persons the Pytho and the Apollo of the fable respectively, and *that* object the exclusive possession, jurisdiction, and administration of the Delphian oracle. And the end and design of the fable, as it may be inferred from the concurrent tendency of its different circumstances, must have been to account for and explain the fact of the possession, the jurisdiction, and the administration, of the oracle in question, their passing from any other owner and master to the Apollo of the fable.

ii. With respect to this oracle, the state of the case be-

<sup>b</sup> Ælian, *Variæ Historiæ*, iii. 1. cf. Pliny, *H. N.* iv. 15: Ovid, *Metam.* i. 568 sqq. Catullus, lxiv. 286 sqq: Livy, xlv. 6.

fore and down to the time of *this* contest must have been supposed *this*; That the oracle itself was in being long before this contest, and was endowed with its proper powers and capabilities long before it also, but that until this time they had been lying in abeyance, and practically useless, the oracle had been closed and debarred from its natural use and application, by having been committed to the custody of a monstrous serpent, the Pytho of the fable, himself as well as the oracle a creature of the earth, and produced from the very first for no other purpose but this of shutting up the oracle, by preventing all access to it.

iii. That consequently to liberate the oracle, to open the way to it, and to render it available for its natural uses and purposes, must be the work, if of anything, of some Power or Principle *ab extra*, distinct from the Pytho in its origin, and superior to it in power and might, and as remarkable for its good will to mankind, as the Pytho for its opposite feeling, and therefore in every sense of the term, Divine; and this Principle *ab extra*, distinct in its origin, its nature, its power and dignity, and its disposition and inclination, from the Pytho of the fable, the Apollo of the fable.

iv. That accordingly, when the fatal time predestined for this change in the ownership of the oracle, and in its use and application, was arrived; the Apollo of the fable, the chosen instrument of this change, is no sooner born than he repairs to Delphi, and as the sign and seal of his essential Divinity, and as the earnest and pledge of his good will to mankind, proceeds to take possession of the oracle in order to throw it open: and when his approach to it is obstructed, and his benevolent intentions are in danger of being defeated, by the opposition of the Pytho, he slays the monster, with his characteristic weapons, the bow and arrows of unerring aim and invincible efficacy—and thereby to all appearance removes for ever the only existing impediment to the natural use and application of the oracle, and the fulfilment of his own good intentions in behalf of mankind.

v. Yet that the death of the Pytho, though followed apparently by such an effect, must have been considered in itself a reason for delaying this consummation, appears from the sequel of the fable. And whatsoever other reasons might

have conspired to suggest so peculiar a course of things, the ostensible ground of this economy may be supposed the fact, that Death and Destruction, even that of a monster like the Pytho, the shedding of blood and the taking away of life under any circumstances, were so repugnant to the goodness, so incompatible with the purity, of the Divine nature, especially such goodness and purity, as those of the new-born and youthful Apollo, that even the death of the Pytho, as the work of his hands, must be considered to have entailed a stain or defilement of the Divine nature within him, which must be cleansed, and done away, in some manner or other, before the Divinity, resident in his Person, could be restored to its essential purity, and left free to act according to the instincts of its essential goodness.

vi. That consequently, and in conformity to the rule and practice of primitive times, when even homicide, without the guilt of murder, was punished with banishment for a certain length of time, the Apollo of the fable, because of the death of the Pytho, and in expiation or purification of the defilement entailed by the death of the Pytho, must voluntarily go into retirement to a certain distance from the scene of this death, and for a certain length of time from the date of this death.

vii. That this distance of the scene of the retirement from the scene of the death must have been assumed as that of the Vale of Tempe from Delphi; and this length of time from the date of the death, the *Annus Magnus* of Hellenic antiquity<sup>c</sup>, the cycle of eight years. With respect to the reason of this latter supposition—if the Pythian cycle itself was originally a cycle of eight years also, it must be self-evident. The reason of the former may not at first sight appear; though we hope to be able to discover it hereafter.

viii. That when this secession from the locality of the oracle, and this delay in the assumption of the ownership of the oracle, was at an end; the conqueror of the Pytho, and the future master of the oracle, as now freed from every pollution, even the accidental one, entailed by the death of the Pytho, returns to the scene of his victory, along a sacred road, which he defines and marks out by his own footsteps

<sup>c</sup> See Vol. iv. 395 sqq. : 409 sqq.

in this first instance, in order to be imitated and followed therein by posterity ever after: and amidst the acclamations of his worshippers, proceeds to take possession of the oracle, and to be installed as the Prophet and Soothsayer, as the Lawgiver and Councillor, of the sons of men in general, and of the Hellenic family of mankind in particular.

ix. That to usher in and inaugurate this consummation, in the first instance, with so much the more solemnity, and as a means of attesting and commemorating it to all posterity, the first Pythia were celebrated, and the Pythian festival, as intended for the observance of posterity, was instituted.

x. Lastly, that these things, as done in the person of the Pytho and in the person of the Apollo of the fable in the first instance, were not supposed to have been done *once* for all, but with a view to their being repeated and done over again, at a certain distance of time, perpetually; that this certain distance of time was the cycle of the Pythian Period, and the proper end and design, the proper use and effect, of the Pythian institution itself was to enact these things over again by imitation and representation, if not in reality, by renewing the contest for the possession of the oracle, with every recurrence of the Pythian Enead, through the several parts and divisions of the Pythian Nome—by slaying the Pytho afresh every eight years—by repeating the temporary retirement from Delphi to the same quarter, as at first, and the temporary suspension of the use and enjoyment of the oracle as at first—and by the same return to Delphi in triumph, to reopen it again at last, and along the same way, as at first; with this difference only that, whereas Apollo himself was the agent or patient in this whole course of things in the first instance, a Delphian Boy, purposely selected to represent him in his youth, his beauty, and the sacredness of his character, went through it on each of *these* occasions in his stead.

ii. The Pytho of the Fable the Type of a Lunæ-solar Cycle of eight years; and the original Pythian Period an Octæ-teric Cycle.

We may observe also that, though the Pytho of the fable in most of the testimonies produced above is spoken of as a

dragon, it may be assumed that its proper denomination was that of a serpent. And indeed even in some of these allusions it is styled Πύθων ὁ ὄφις as well as Πύθων ὁ δράκων or ἡ δράκαινα. But in reality a dragon, after all, is a serpent. A dragon is merely a serpent of unusual size; an exaggeration of the nature and idea of the serpent. We may take it for granted therefore that, though the specific distinction of the Pytho of the fable may be that of a dragon, its generic idea must have been that of a serpent.

And this being assumed accordingly—then, with regard to any further meaning which must have been attached even to the idea of a serpent in this instance; it is scarcely necessary to prove so well known and so generally admitted a fact as *this*, That among the nations of antiquity, beginning with the Egyptians, the serpent was an Emblem of Time in some point of view, and in some relation or other—sometimes of time, in the sense of duration in general, sometimes of time, in the sense of duration modified and limited after some manner or other in particular<sup>d</sup>. In the symbolical language of hieroglyphics a serpent with his tail in his mouth was a type of eternity, which has neither beginning nor end; and through that, of duration in its simplest and most abstract form—of duration not yet subjected to any of the measures of succession, and therefore distinct from time. And yet the same emblem was not less proper for duration, subjected to some of the measures of its own succession; for duration, perpetually coming to an end and perpetually beginning again; for duration, in short, limited by a cycle of some kind, always the same, always going on in the same way, always coming to an end, and yet always beginning again. A serpent, we say, in that position which the serpent naturally assumes when at rest—coiled up in a number of concentric folds, and with its head and its tail in contact—is the most appropriate emblem imaginable of duration in the form of a cycle, and of that property of every cycle which we may call *periodicity*<sup>e</sup>—the property of coming to an end only to begin again, and of going on perpetually in the same way. The ancient Egyptians, for this reason, appear to have very early fixed on this emblem as the representative of the

<sup>d</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iii. 177 n.

<sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. 20.

sphere<sup>f</sup>, itself a cycle—the cycle of the ecliptic, the circuit of the sun in the heavens—which began originally, and has ever since been renewed, from the same point and in the same direction, every year. And we have already seen that both the dragon of Cadmus and the dragon of Lætes, exaggerated expressions of the idea of the serpent as they were, were after all Types of the sphere<sup>g</sup>. Among the ancient Mexicans, the serpent encircling the calendar, as delineated through one of its secular Periods, and with its tail in its mouth, was the Emblem of this Period itself; and it is far from improbable that even the ophiolatry, or serpent-worship, of some of the nations of antiquity, which divines have been inclined to trace up to the traditions of the Fall, and to appeal to in illustration of the Scriptural account of the Temptation, in which the Serpent acts so conspicuous a part, is rather to be explained on this principle of the Personification of Time, under this very appropriate emblem, in some relation or other; and in particular as the symbol of the sun, the great serpent of the heavens, and of time in the sense of the natural tropical year, the annual cycle described in the ecliptic by the sun.

With respect then to the Pytho of this fable; if he was after all only a serpent, it would be an obvious conjecture that he must always have been intended as a type of Time in some relation or other, and most properly in that of a cycle of some kind. But here it is very necessary to draw a distinction—(implied in the reason of things, though not expressly pointed out in the fable itself—) in the application of this image itself to the serpent of the fable, before and after the contest of the Pytho of the fable and the Apollo of the fable, respectively. The Pytho of the fable had an existence before this contest; and it is assumed that he has an existence even after it, though it ended apparently in his death. The meaning of these different suppositions is that, down to the time of the coming of Apollo to Delphi, the Pytho had an existence indeed, but of indefinite duration, commensurable at least with that of the oracle, of which he had been appointed the keeper from the first, and an exist-

<sup>f</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Cath.* iii. 409.

<sup>g</sup> *Supra*, page 147. 167 *n.*

ence of one and the same kind, and subject as yet to no interruption of its continuity; from the time of this coming he has an existence also, but not an uniform, nor continuous one. He has the existence of a being at one time dying, at another reviving, only to die again, and after dying again, to come to life again; and so on, in the same way perpetually.

It is manifest therefore that the true point of view in which the Pytho of the fable is to be regarded before and after the beginning of the contest of the fable, is that of the symbol of the same thing in general, but different in particular, before and after the same point of time. Up to the beginning of that contest, he is the type of Duration, not yet subject to any of the measures of itself which constitute time, though capable of being so; from the date of that contest, he is the type of Duration as now subjected to some of the measures of its own succession; consequently of Duration, in a mode and form of existence no longer uniform and continuous, but as often apparently coming to an end, as beginning again, and *vice versa*; in one word, of time, in contradistinction to duration—of time as a segment or part of duration, cut off and detached, by the law of its being, from the essence of duration, yet never absolutely coming to an end, but continuing like duration, and though distinct from it, yet accompanying it, and proceeding parallel to it, perpetually.

The proper idea therefore of the Pytho of the fable, up to the time of the arrival of the Pythian Apollo at Delphi, is that of duration, as always capable of becoming time, (i. e. being subjected to some of the measures of its own succession,) but not yet become so, nor yet subject to any of those measures; and from the time of that arrival it is the idea of duration in the sense of time—of duration limited and measured by a cycle of some kind perpetually. And this proper idea of the Pytho of the fable, thus deducible from the assumptions of the fable itself, is confirmed by the etymon and meaning of the name of the Pytho, as we hope to see hereafter, denoting nothing more or less than a segment of a certain kind, cut off and detached from some larger subject of the same kind, which under the circumstances of the case



could be nothing but the essence of duration in contradistinction to that of time.

And that this segment, in the original apprehension thereof by the author of the fable, must have been a cycle of eight years, might be inferred from that part of the preceding accounts, in which the Pytho is represented as found by Apollo, coiled about the basin at Delphi, or at least the oracular orifice in the centre, in nine spires or folds; and therefore as the type of a cycle of nine years in the sense of eight, even before the Pythian cycle itself was yet in being. And even that, under the circumstances of the case, would be an allowable supposition; on the principle that it is of the nature of every cycle, as soon as it comes into existence, to be applicable backwards as well as forwards. And though every actual cycle must have an historical epoch, yet by virtue of this property, having once come into existence, it may be regarded as if it had existed from all eternity. So that in one sense and one relation the Pythian cycle might be no older than this coming of Apollo to Delphi; in another might be indefinitely older. We cannot indeed assume it as certain that this circumstance of the later representation of the Pythian fable, (the discovery of the serpent Pytho coiled about the Delphian cavity in these nine enormous folds,) made part of the description from the first; and yet that the serpent, so coiled, must have been intended of the type of a cycle, and a cycle of eight years, will follow just the same. It is proved and placed out of question by the Pythian cycle itself.

And that this cycle denoted by the Pytho of the fable must have been a lunar and solar cycle, and that kind of lunar and solar cycle which, as a cycle of eight years, must have been intended of the octaëteric, properly so called, though not expressly affirmed in any of the preceding statements, may be inferred from various considerations. i. From the necessity of the case, and the reason of things; there being no solar cycle known to the Greeks which was not a lunar one also, nor any lunar and solar cycle of eight terms, but the octaëteric. ii. The Pytho, before the coming of Apollo to Delphi, was not yet the type of time, in the sense of a cycle, but the type of duration, which is not time, though capable

of becoming so; after the coming of Apollo, and from that time forward, he is the type of time, as contradistinguished to duration, and no longer of duration, as distinct from time; and this change in his nature is the effect of the coming of Apollo to Delphi. That which converts the Pytho of the fable as the type of duration, into the Pytho as the type of time, is the Apollo of the fable, as the sun; and yet, as we hope to see by and by, not without the joint instrumentality and cooperation of the Artemis of the fable also, or the moon. If so, the cycle, the resulting effect of this joint agency of the sun and the moon, personified at last by the Pytho of the fable, must be a lunar and solar cycle.

iii. There is a standing epithet of Apollo, in the Greek poets, *ἐκατηβόλος*, or *ἐκατηβελέτης*<sup>h</sup>, which is often explained as if the same with *ἐκηβόλος*, in the sense of “far-shooting;” or “shooting from afar:” and consequently as if derived from *ἐκὰς* and *βάλλω*. But there is another explanation of the meaning of this word, which is still more naturally suggested by its own composition, *ἐκατὸν* and *βέλος*: and that this too was not unknown to the grammarians of antiquity, appears from the gloss of Hesychius on *Ἐκατηβόλος* and *Ἐκηβόλος*—not only, *Ὁ ἕκαθεν βάλλων καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνων*, but also, *Τινὲς δὲ ἐπεὶ ἐκατὸν βέλεσι τὸν ἐν Πυθοῖ δράκοντα ἀνέειλεν Ἀπόλλων*. This is given also in the Scholia on the Scutum of Hesiod<sup>i</sup>—

*Εὔρε γὰρ ἐν τεμένει ἐκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος—*

*Ἐκηβόλος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκὰς, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ μακρὰν, καὶ τοῦ βάλλω.... ἐκατηβόλος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκατὸν καὶ τοῦ βέλος. μυθεύονται γὰρ ὅτι ἐκατὸν βέλεσι τὸν δράκοντα τὸν ἐν Πυθοῖ ἀνέειλεν.*

In our opinion *this* is the true explanation of the epithet in question; founded on the fact of the Pytho's having been the type of the lunæ-solar cycle of eight years. It was peculiar to that cycle to be comprehended in eight solar years, and 99 lunar months, or cyclically reckoned, in nine of the former, and one hundred of the latter. And these hundred months of the cycle were the *βέλη*, the arrows of the Apollo of the Pythian fable, to which the death of the Pytho was traditionally attributed from the first. These hundred months of the cycle were the measure of the life of the Pytho, the type of the cycle. At the beginning of these he

<sup>h</sup> Vide Hesiod. Scutum, 58. 100.

<sup>i</sup> Ver. 58.

revived, at the end he expired, perpetually. It was no far-fetched idea to apply the title of Ἐκατος to Apollo, in this sense of the Lord of the hundred: or that of Ἐκατηβόλος, or Ἐκατηβελέτης, as making use of these hundred shafts, to slay the Pytho, and to bring the cycle, typified by him, to an end perpetually\*.

And this view of the nature and meaning of the Pytho of the fable and of the Apollo of the fable supplies the true explanation also of the banishment or secession even of the

\* Analogy indeed might seem to have required Ἐκατοβόλος from ἐκατὸν and βάλω, and Ἐκατοβελέτης from ἐκατὸν and βέλος: but these epithets were no doubt first invented by the epic poets; and neither ἐκατοβόλος nor ἐκατοβελέτης could have got admission into epic verse.

The epithet of Ἐκατος too, as commonly applied to Apollo, would be more probably derived from this supposed relation of his to the Hundred, than from ἐκάς—as if ἐκατος meant the same thing as ὁ ἕκαθεν βάλων, the “far-shooting,” or simply as the “distant-one,” like another of the titles of the sun in Greek, Ὑπερίων. Ἐκηβόλος indeed might have the sense of “far-shooting,” or “shooting from afar,” and might be derivable from ἐκάς and βάλω; but it is far from improbable that even Ἐκηβόλος, as a standing epithet of Apollo, is itself per syncopen for ἐκατηβόλος. The idea of the Mistress of the Hundred would be just as applicable to the Pythian Artemis, the impersonation of lunar time in the Octaëteric cycle, as to the Pythian Apollo, the impersonation of solar: and even more so, forasmuch as the hundred months of the Octaëteric cycle were more properly lunar than solar: and it is almost superfluous to observe, that Ἐκάτη is even more regularly applied to Artemis than Ἐκατος to Apollo.

Hephæstion<sup>1</sup>: Ὡς παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι

Ἐκατον Διὸς υἱόν.

Æschylus<sup>2</sup>:

Ἄρτεμιν δ' Ἐκάταν γυναικῶν λέχος ἐφορεύειν.

Euripides<sup>3</sup>:

Ἴω πότνια παῖ Λατοῦς

Ἐκάτα—

With respect to this use of Ἐκατος, as derivable from ἐκατὸν, and one of the titles of Apollo, the ancients observe that the name of Ἐκατόνησοι was given to certain islands, (20 in number,) round about Lesbos, in the sense of Ἀπολλώνησοι: Ἐκατόνησοι<sup>4</sup>. . . περὶ τὸν Ἐκατὸν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα—Ἐκατόνησοι, αἱ τοῦ Ἐκάτου, ἡγούσιν Ἀπόλλωνος<sup>5</sup>: which, it appears to us, confirms our explanation of the etymon of the title itself.

<sup>1</sup> De Metris, xii.

<sup>2</sup> Supplices, 676.

<sup>3</sup> Phœnissæ, 108. cf. Phurnutus, cf. ad Il. A. 65. 49. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Steph. Byz.

<sup>5</sup> Eustathius ad Dionys. Perieg. 404.

Apollo of the fable, after the death of the Pytho, as that one of its circumstances which must have constituted its principal peculiarity from the first, and yet, *a priori*, was least of all to have been expected. For if the end and object of the contest of Apollo with the Pytho was simply to secure the possession of the oracle to the former; what was more naturally to be expected than that, as soon as this end had been attained by the death of the Pytho, he should have been represented as reaping forthwith the fruits of his victory? The popular explanation of the œconomy of the fable in this respect might indeed be, and probably was, that which we ourselves have assigned supra<sup>k</sup>; either the essential goodness and purity of the Divine nature, abhorrent *per se* from death and destruction of any kind, or the rule and custom of antiquity, which required the shedding of blood even under the most justifiable circumstances, to be atoned for, and purged, by a voluntary banishment for a certain length of time. But if the Pytho of the fable was after all the Type of a lunar and solar cycle, and the Apollo was the impersonation of the solar element (virtually including the lunar also) of such a cycle; the true reason of the œconomy of the fable, in this one respect, is no doubt to be found in the first principles of every such cycle, and in the relation of its constituent parts to each other.

The definition of a solar and lunar cycle of any kind is The interval between a certain state and relation of the sun and the moon, in themselves and to each other, brought about by the respective momenta of each, in one instance, and the same state and relation similarly brought about in the next to it: for example, between the solar and lunar conjunction, under certain circumstances, in one instance, and the solar and lunar conjunction under the same circumstances again. And this can happen only once in the course of any such cycle; and the precise time when it happens is the end of one such cycle and the beginning of the next: and the mode or process in which it is brought about being the decursus of the solar and the lunar momenta, each according to their proper laws, through the several years of the cycle, until the precise moment when it happens. these dif-

ferent momenta, even in the same cycle and even as tending to this consummation perpetually, must appear to be entirely distinct from and independent of each other. On this principle the Apollo of the fable could be seen at Delphi in particular only *once* in the course of every cycle; and that once critically between the end of one such cycle and the beginning of the next (the very time between two consecutive cycles, at which the Pytho also came to life again, but only to die afresh). At any other time but that he must be absent from Delphi at least—wheresoever else he might be personally present—as the fable, for reasons of another kind, supposes him to be at Tempe in particular.

And from this state of the case with respect to the presence and the absence of the Apollo of the fable, relatively to the scene of the contest with the Pytho, it is another obvious inference that, if his own presence at Delphi in person was thus limited to the beginning of every fresh cycle of the Pythian Period, the use of the oracle, which could go on only during his personal presence at Delphi, must have been similarly limited also. It must have made part of the conception and plan of the Pythian institution from the first that the oracle itself, even as the right and property of the Pythian Apollo, should not be open to consultation at all times, but only at those solemn conjunctures of the personal presence of the owner of the oracle himself at the beginning of the Pythian Period, and for the prescribed duration of the Pythian festival. This, we say, must have been the rule of the oracle at first, if the oracle, and the god of the oracle, the festival and the cycle of the festival, all came into being together: though, as the oracle itself increased in importance and in estimation, it was very probable that this rule would be relaxed in the course of time (as it actually appears to have been) for some other, which was calculated to render it more frequently accessible, and consequently more generally useful.

Lastly, this view of the original relation of the Pythian Apollo to the Pythian cycle, supplies the best explanation of another characteristic distinction of the Pythian solemnity from the first, the Pythian *Καλιώς*. Pausanias told us<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, 641.

there was originally no temple at Delphi; nothing but a *Σκηυή*, booth or tent, made of boughs of laurel, in the shape of a *Καλύβη*, a cabin or hut. The proper locality of the Pythian *Καλιὰς* too, as designated by Plutarch<sup>m</sup> in one instance by the *Σεπτήριον*, in another by the *Ἄλωσ*, barn-floor or area, of some kind, was probably the same which Pausanias calls the *Ἱερὸς περίβολος* in general<sup>n</sup>, the area or floor of the sacred enclosure, only the middle or innermost part of it in particular.

There is every reason to believe that Pausanias was right in this statement—that there was actually no temple at Delphi, at first—nothing but the booth or tabernacle, the proper representative of which down to the latest time, and even in the midst of all the grandeur and the magnificence of the temple actually erected on the same spot at last, was still retained in the *Καλιὰς* of classical antiquity, the *Καλιὰς* of the Pythian solemnity\*. And the reason of this peculiarity is now intelligible. There could have been no temple at Delphi originally because there was no permanent occupant of such a temple. A temporary habitation supplied by the *Σκηυή* or tabernacle in question was all that was necessary for a temporary inhabitant.

It appears too from the preceding testimonies, especially

\* And as on this supposition there could have been nothing at Delphi originally but this booth, or bower, made of branches, and covered with leaves, so, it appears from the testimony of Homer, was there nothing as yet in his time in the shape of a temple at Delphi but an area or floor—such as Plutarch also seems to have meant by his *Σεπτήριον* or *Ἄλωσ*—with probably a few steps leading up to it, and a landing place of stone, or pavement, at the top, surrounded by a low wall of similar materials. He speaks at least of nothing at Pytho or Delphi, when Agamemnon was there consulting the oracle, before the expedition, in the shape of a sacred enclosure, but a *λαῖνος οὐδός*—

*Πυθοί ἐν ἡγαθέῃ ὄθ' ὑπέρβη λαῖνον οὐδόν.*

*Odyss.* Θ, 80. cf. ad *Il.* I. 404.

And even the author of the Hymn to Apollo, so much later than Homer, who ascribes the foundation of the temple at Delphi itself to Apollo as soon as born, speaks of nothing as raised upon it, at the time, except this *λαῖνος οὐδός*—the work of Trophonius and Agamedes, the sons of Ergines: cf. 294-297, Pausanias, x. v. 5, and the Scholia on the Scutum of Hesiod, vers. 70.

<sup>m</sup> *Supra*, 640.

<sup>n</sup> x. viii. ad fin.

from that of Ephorus, reported by Strabo, and that of Plutarch, that it was the rule in later times, (and therefore we may presume from the first.) to burn this *Καλιᾶς*—but only at that period in the decursus of every cycle when the youth, who was destined to represent the Apollo of the fable in his temporary banishment, in his purification meanwhile, and in his return in triumph at last, was about to be sent on his mystical errand—that is, just at the end of one cycle and just at the beginning of the next. The reason of this rule too is obvious. A fresh booth was wanted for every fresh cycle; and the first step towards the provision of a new one was the destruction of the old one—which having been kept in being for the course of its proper cycle, had now served its proper use and purpose. And as to the mode of its destruction, which appears to have been by setting it on fire, that too might have been prescribed from the first, as the fittest and most appropriate for the vacant habitation of the god of fire, the Sun. In any case, the destruction of an old tabernacle of this kind was so natural a preliminary to the construction of a new one of the same kind, that nothing more than the reason of the thing can be necessary to explain this one of the ceremonies of the Pythian solemnity from the earliest to the latest times; though, in the manner in which even this was done at the proper time—in the *Δολωιεία* (*Θύρα*)—the approach to it by stealth—and the precipitate retreat of the persons charged with the performance of this duty, as soon as they had executed their office, without venturing to look behind them—there is a degree of mystery which has not been explained, and seems to have led both Ephorus and Plutarch to put a wrong construction on this part of the ceremony. And yet even this too is capable of being explained, if the *Καλιᾶς*, which was thus periodically destined to destruction, as no longer useful, was notwithstanding a shrine, and a temple, while it was still in use; consecrated to and sanctified by the indwelling of such a divinity as the Pythian Apollo: to destroy which, even when forsaken or about to be forsaken by its former inhabitant, might look like an act of impiety and profanation, which could not be ventured upon without fear and trembling.

SECTION VI.—*On the etymon of the names of Πύθων, Ἄπόλλων, Ἄρτεμις, and Λατώ, respectively.*

We shall proceed to confirm the above conclusions, respecting the nature and final end of the Pythian institution, by inquiring into the etymon and meaning of the names of the persons, which figure in the Pythian fable as agent and patient respectively; i. e. of the name of the Πύθων of the fable, as applied to the Patient, and that of the Ἄπόλλων, as applied to the Agent; and along with these, into the etymon and signification of the names of Ἄρτεμις and Λατώ—of the former, as virtually associated in the character of the agent with that of the Ἄπόλλων of the fable, and of that of the latter, as actually associated in the Γένεσις of the fable with both\*.

\* Though there is no mention in the accounts of the Pythian fable, produced supra, of the name of Ἄρτεμις, or Ἄρταμις, much less of that of Λατώ, there can be no doubt that the Grecian Ἄπόλλων and Ἄρτεμις must always have gone together, and the author of the idea and name of the one must have been that of those of the other. It is certain at least that in the popular apprehension these ideas and names were associated, as those of the children of the same mother, conceived at once and born at once, or one soon after the other; and there is every reason to believe that this popular view of their origin, and of their relation to each other, was but the reflection of the original fable, embodied in the Γένεσις of Philammon.

It is no objection that neither the name of Ἄρταμις nor that of Λατώ has been handed down along with the Pythian fable. The Apollo of this fable included the Artamis, just as necessarily as the solar element in a common solar and lunar cycle, includes the lunar. Apollo, as the sun, might be the ostensible instrument in the destruction of the Pytho; but Artamis, as the moon, must have been equally concerned in it also, if the Pytho, after all, was only the type of a lunar and solar cycle, cut off from the essence of duration, by the joint agency of the sun and the moon, perpetually. The popular tradition and belief ascribed the possession of the same irresistible arms, and the same power of using them, to the Grecian Artemis, as to the Grecian Apollo; and though in the traditionary accounts of the Pythian fable Ἄρταμις and Λατώ appear to be κωφὰ πρόσωπα at present, and the only πρωταγωνιστῆς to be the Ἄπόλλων, no one can say what part might have been assigned to them in the μέλη, or χοροὶ, composed for the Pythian solemnity at first, and appointed to be sung as accompaniments of it ever after.

In a word, in the details and œconomy of a lunar and solar cycle, it is impossible to dispense with the instrumentality of either of the elements, which enter into its constitution. Both must be regarded as working together; and if, for special reasons, in a particular instance, the joint effect of the agency of both is assigned to one of them, it must be as representing and including the other.



i. Then, with regard to the etymon of the name of the Πύθων of the fable, the grammarians and scholiasts of antiquity have proposed only two explanations on grammatical or etymological principles. First, assuming that the name of the oracle in their *own* time, and long before their time, Πυθῶ, was the same with that of the serpent Πύθων, they have endeavoured to account for it, as applicable to both, by supposing it to have been derived ἀπὸ τοῦ πυθέσθαι, that is, from the resort to the oracle, from the mode in which it was consulted, by putting questions and receiving answers; that being the proper sense of πυθέσθαι in Greek, and such being the use which was actually made of the oracle in ancient times.

The first objection to this derivation would be that, on this principle, the first syllable in the name of the Πύθων ought to have been short, whereas it was notoriously long; but as this objection appears to have occurred to the learned Greeks in former times<sup>o</sup>, and yet not to have been considered insuperable, we shall not insist upon it. The next, and a still more serious one, would be this; that on this supposition the name of the Pytho would have been derived ἀπὸ τοῦ πυθέσθαι, as much as that of the oracle; which would be palpably absurd: i. Because the Pytho, though the keeper of the oracle, could not have been the same with the oracle, nor could access to the oracle, or consultation of the oracle, have been access to the Pytho, or consultation of the Pytho: ii. Because the very occasion of the existence of the Pytho, the very end and purpose for which it came into being, and was entrusted with the custody of the oracle at first, was not to facilitate the approach to it, nor to promote the use of it, but on the contrary, to prevent all access to it, to close it against inquirers, and to render it absolutely useless as long as the Pytho itself was alive.

Secondly, assuming the literal existence of the Pytho of the fable, before its contest with the Apollo of the fable, and the literal death of this Pytho in that contest, and the literal truth of its gigantic and monstrous proportions, they have explained its name of the Πύθων, as if it was derived ἀπὸ τοῦ πύθειν—its rotting away, exposed to the air and the other

<sup>o</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 278 a.

elements, on the locality of the contest; that being the literal meaning of *πίθειω* in Greek, *to rot*, or *to be made to rot*, in the way of natural decay, and so far synonymous with *σῆπασθαι*. This etymon is not liable to the same objection as the former; for the first syllable of *πίθω*, in this sense of *to rot*, is naturally long: and as no one among the Greeks of later times probably thought of doubting of the actual existence of the Pytho, no more than of that of Apollo, or even thought of calling in question the fact of this contest between them some time or other, for the possession of the Pythian oracle, it is no wonder that this should have been the explanation most generally received. Such is the etymon proposed by the author of the Hymn to Apollo, and on no less an authority than that of the Apollo of the hymn himself; the first, according to this hymn, who gave this name to the monster, just slain by his arrows, and for this reason, as destined to lie, exposed to the air and rotting, on the spot where he had been slain p.

On this principle then the serpent Pytho must have obtained the name by which he was known to posterity, only after his death, and in consequence of it; whereas the Pytho of the Pythian fable had an existence, and under that name, long before his death. It cannot be necessary however to multiply arguments for the conviction of an explanation which proceeds on the hypothesis of the literal existence of the Pytho of the fable, and of the literal truth of its contest with the Apollo of the fable; in other words, of the simple historical truth of everything in this fable, which the inventor of the fable himself intended to be figuratively and symbolically understood.

Besides these two explanations of the name of the *Πύθων*, on etymological principles, it does not appear that the Greek grammarians were able to discover a third; from which fact we may reasonably infer that the Greek language was not competent to supply another; and consequently that if the use and application of the name in the sense of a cycle, which we have already deduced from the consideration of the fable and its circumstances, is capable of being accounted for *virtute termini*, it must be by means of some other language, not

of the Greek. If the ancient Egyptian therefore, or the ancient Phœnician (which we assume to have been the same with the ancient Hebrew) can furnish an etymon, such as we are in search of, there is no reason why we should not be allowed to avail ourselves of it, for the purpose of illustrating the peculiar sense of this term, even as synonymous with a cycle—especially after the proofs which have been produced, in the preceding Dissertations, of the close and familiar intercourse, even at this early period, between Greece and Egypt or Phœnicia.

Now though we have not been able to find any theme in the ancient Egyptian, which might have given birth to such a derivative in the ancient Greek, as this of Πύθωνι in the sense of a cycle, yet in the Hebrew or Phœnician the word for a small but still an *integral* part of anything (a morsel or piece of bread for instance, as part of a loaf) is Pheth. And what is a cycle, as such, but a fractional part of Duration? It appears too from Gesenius<sup>q</sup> that the etymological form of the term, in this sense, is Phouth or Phũth rather than Pheth: and if we may assume that there was such a noun substantive in the ancient Hebrew as this Phouth or Phuth, then, as transferred to the Greek, and expressed in Greek according to the analogy of a numerous class of similar terms<sup>r</sup>, it would become Φυθ or Ηυθ. Φυθὼ or Πυθῶ: because, as the Hebrew has no character for the Greek Η or the Latin P, and makes use of the same sign of its own, for the sound Phe and the sound Pe, the Hebrew Phuth, transferred to the Greek, might be either Φυθ or Ηυθ; the latter of which would assume the idiomatic form of Πυθῶ. We do not indeed know for certain whether the original form of the name of the serpent Pytho was Πυθὼ or Ηύθων; but we do know that the oldest form of the name of the oracle was Πυθῶ: and it may reasonably be supposed that the name of the oracle was taken from that of the serpent its keeper. And Πυθὼ being the original name even of the serpent, it is easy to see that Πυθῶν or Πύθων would be derivable from it, and only accidentally different.

Now this word Pheth or Phũth in the Hebrew, (Φυθ or

<sup>q</sup> In voce.

<sup>r</sup> See Vol. iv. page 452.

Πῶθ in the Greek,) according to Gesenius denoted a *space*, an *interval*, an *interstice*, of any kind: and what could be more appropriate than that to the idea of a cycle, which also is a *space*, an *interval*, an *interstice*, or *separation*, between the parts of an otherwise continuous succession, which we call Duration? Time itself is merely duration broken up into spaces or intervals; especially time in the form of a cycle: for a cycle too is an integral part of duration, only of uniform length and of constant recurrence. We are therefore entirely of opinion that the root of the name of the serpent in the Pythian fable was this Hebrew or Phœnician Phūth, in the sense of a determinate space between the parts of a continuous succession—which we mean by duration; i. e. a cycle: and that, as so derived, its first form in the Greek was Πυθῶ, properly as the name of the serpent who had the custody of the oracle, before the commencement of the action of the fable, and secondarily as that of the oracle, to which it stood in the relation of keeper.

ii. With regard to the name of Ἀπόλλων—in the first place it may be observed, that there was probably no object recognised among the Greeks as divine, which was proposed in a greater variety of relations to other things, and characterized by a greater variety of appellations, than the Hellenic Apollo: the reason of which is apparent, as soon as it is understood that, in every one of those relations, and under each of these names, the Hellenic Apollo was, after all, the sun—the most conspicuous object in external nature, the most ubiquitous in its presence and influence, the most perceptible in its energies and operations, the most powerful both for good and for evil, and the most capable *a priori* of being contemplated in every point of view, and exhibited in every kind of relation, both physical and moral, and addressed and personified by every kind of title conformably to such views, and expressive of such relations.

The most complete enumeration of these different styles of the sun, together with the reasons on which they were founded, or supposed to have been founded, is given in Macrobius<sup>s</sup>. We may observe upon all of them in common,

<sup>s</sup> Saturnalia, i. 17, 18. cf. also Phurnutus, cap. 32. De Apolline et Diana.

(and *this* is the most important consideration for *our* purpose.) that they are styles and titles of one subject and one person—and that one subject or person the Grecian Apollo. It follows that the name of Ἀπόλλων, as the proper name of this person, must have been older than all of them; and as all of them recognise and presuppose this, all must have been merely synonymous adjuncts or expletives of this. The ultimate question therefore, in each of these cases, will still be *this*: What was the meaning of this name of Ἀπόλλων—the generic name of every individual Apollo, whatsoever his proper style and title besides? and what idea or person was the proper subject of that name originally? for if there was a conception, for which this name was first intended, and of which it was first predicated, it will follow that *this* must have been the prototype of every other of the same name, howsoever discriminated from this by a name of its own. And if it can be made to appear that this original subject of the name of Ἀπόλλων must have been the Pythian Apollo, and that even the name itself could not have been predicable from the first of any but the Pythian Apollo—it will follow from this fact also that the Pythian Apollo must have been the first of its kind, and the first author of this name for the Pythian Apollo must have been the first author of the idea and conception of the Grecian Apollo himself.

With respect then to the etymon of this name of Ἀπόλλων, Macrobius observes v, Plato solem Ἀπόλλωνα cognominatum scribit Ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰὲ πάλλειν τὰς ἀκτῖνας, id est a jactu radiorum: Chrysippus Apollinem Ὡς οὐχὶ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ φανλῶν οὐσιῶν τοῦ πυρὸς ὄντα (όντος), prima enim nominis littera retinet significationem negandi; ἢ ὅτι μόνος ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐχὶ πολλοί .... Speusippus quod ex multis ignibus constet vis ejus, Ὡς ἀπὸ πολλῶν οὐσιῶν πυρὸς αὐτοῦ συνεστῶτος: Cleanthes, Ὡς ἀπ' ἄλλων καὶ ἄλλων τὰς ἀνατολὰς ποιουμένον. And these may serve as specimens of the explanations of the well-known name of so familiar an object in external nature as the sun, which the philosophers of old proposed. In his Cratylus however Plato suggests a double explanation, one from ἀπο-λύω or ἀπολούω, the other from ἀπλοῦς; the former making

the name of Ἀπόλλων equivalent to Ἀπολύων or Ἀπολούων, the latter the same with the Thessalian form of the name itself, Ἀπλῶν for Ἀπόλλων: Κατὰ μὲν τοίνυν τὰς ἀπολύσεις τε καὶ ἀπολούσεις, ὡς ἰατρὸς ὢν τῶν τοιούτων, Ἀπολούων ἂν ὀρθῶς καλοῖτο· κατὰ δὲ τὴν μαρτικὴν καὶ τὸ ἀληθές τε καὶ τὸ ἀπλοῦν (ταῦτον γὰρ ἔστιν), ὥσπερ οἶν οἱ Θετταλοὶ καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ὀρθότατ' ἂν καλοῖτο· Ἀπλῶν γὰρ φασὶ πάντες Θετταλοὶ τοῦτον τὸν θεόν<sup>x</sup>. With respect to the name of Apollo in Thessaly, the matter of fact may have been as it is here implied; and an inscription is actually extant, Ἀμπλονι Τεμπείρα<sup>z</sup>, which so far confirms this statement of Plato's: and yet it will not follow that this Thessalian form of the name was derived from ἀπλοῦς, and not rather from Ἀπόλλων itself, of which it is only an accidental variation, peculiar to the dialect of Thessaly.

Yet that this name of Ἀπόλλων, in the popular apprehension, carried with it a very different meaning from any of these, appears from the same dialogue<sup>a</sup>: Ταῦτον δὲ καὶ περὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, ὅπερ λέγω<sup>b</sup>, πολλοὶ πεφόβηται περὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς τι δεινὸν μνηύοντος: that is, the common people were afraid of Apollo, because of his name, as intimating something terrible. Now this leads us at once to the etymon of the name, as indicated by the name itself—as derivable from ἀπόλλω in the sense of ἀπολλύω or ἀπόλλυμι; and recognising the subject of the name, *virtute termini*, as the Destroyer, in some sense or other. And that this simple and obvious explanation, suggested by the name itself, did not escape the philosophers of antiquity, (though none of them has made the right use of it,) appears from the same chapter of Macrobius<sup>d</sup>: Alii cognominatum Apollinem putant ὡς ἀπολλύντα τὰ ζῶα. exanimat enim et perimit animantes, cum pestem intemperie caloris inmittit: to which there is nothing to object except the mistake, in point of fact, that this name was given to Apollo as the destroyer in general, and not as the destroyer in particular—as the destroyer of breathing ones in general, in the way supposed, and not of the Pytho of the fable, in the way supposed by the fable, in particular. But that Ἀπόλλων, *virtute termini*, meant nothing but the de-

<sup>x</sup> Pars ii. vol. ii. 48, 49.

<sup>z</sup> Corpus Inscript. No. 1767.

<sup>a</sup> Loc. cit. 47. 17.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. l. 6.

<sup>d</sup> Saturnalia, i. 17. 286.

stroyer, is proved by the testimony of Archilochus and Euripides, each of them quoted by Macrobius in the same place, and in illustration of this meaning itself. Archilochus—

Ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων καὶ σὺ τοὺς μὲν αἰτίους  
πήμαινε, καὶ σφᾶς ὄλλυ' ὥσπερ ὀλλύεις—

Euripides in the Phaëthon—

Ἦ χρυσοφεγγές ἦλι' ὧς μ' ἀπόλεσας·  
ὅθεν σ' Ἀπόλλων' ἐμφανῶς κλήσει βροτός.

And to this we may add that of Æschylus, who puts the same construction of the name into the mouth of his Cassandra—

Ἀπολλων Ἄπολλον  
ἀγνῆτ' ἀπόλλων ἐμός·  
ἀπόλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον<sup>e</sup>—

i. e. destroyer, my destroyer.

There can consequently be no doubt that the proper grammatical sense of this word in Greek must have been that of the destroyer: and if so, it points at once to its origin—viz. that it must have been invented for the use of the Pythian fable, and came into existence along with the Pythian Apollo. And though there can be no question that the subject or person, denoted by this Apollo from the first, must have been the sun; yet it was the sun only as the antagonist of the Pytho, and therefore not as what he was in himself, but in relation to the Pytho—the destroyer of the Pytho. The sun had no part or office assigned him in this fable, but that of destroying the Pytho—of destroying him at first, in the first instance of his coming into contact with him, of destroying him again ever after, as often as he came to life again. We conclude then that *this*, and *this* only, is the true explanation of the name; that the Apollo of the Pythian fable was so called because he was the destroyer of the Pytho, i. e. the Apollo of the Pytho; and for no other reason whatsoever.

iii. With respect to the name of Ἄρτεμις, the explanation proposed by the ancients is commonly either that it was the same with Ἀρτεμῆς, or the same with Ἀεροτεμῆς. As derivable from the former of these terms, it would denote simply *sound*, or *entire*; in which case, it would be difficult to shew

<sup>e</sup> Agamemnon, 1080.

why it should have been applied to the moon, more than to any other of the heavenly bodies, all of which are sound and entire too—or to any other object in nature besides, which was merely perfect of its kind. With respect to the second of these etymons, we would not venture to say that the derivation of Ἄρτεμις from Ἄεροτεμῖς, on grammatical principles, was not admissible; but we may justly object that as so derived the name itself, in this sense of the cutter or divider of the air, would not be more applicable to the moon than to any other of the heavenly bodies, all of which move through the air alike, and divide the air alike. And on this principle it might with just as much reason have been expected that ἀεροτόμος or ἄρτομος would have been the name of the sun, as Ἄεροτεμῖς or Ἄρτεμις that of the moon: and perhaps more so, because the sun is so much more remarkable in all respects than the moon, and the motion of the sun through the air is performed by day, that of the moon by night. We may take it for granted that names were not imposed on things, upon such vague and indefinite principles as these, among the ancient Greeks, no more than anywhere else.

With respect then to the true explanation of this name also, the first observation which may be made is this; that if the Apollo and the Artemis of Hellenic mythology both came into existence together, it is only consistent to suppose that both received those names together; and that if the name of Apollo was purposely invented for one of them by Philammon of Delphi, (to whom the Γένεσις of both, as we have seen, is uniformly attributed,) along with the rest of the Pythian fable, the name of Artemis was purposely invented by him, at the same time and on the same occasion, for the other also. The next is, that if the name of his Apollo was invented and imposed by Philammon, for a special reason and with a particular reference to something else, nothing could be more probable *a priori*, than that the name of his Artemis must have been invented for a special reason, and with a special reference also: that is, if he took the name of his Apollo, not from what he was in himself, but in relation to the Pytho, nothing would be more probable than that he would take that of his Artemis, not from what



she was in herself, but from what she was in his scheme in reference to the Pytho. Let us therefore inquire whether this word Ἄρτεμις in Greek, as well as that of Ἄπόλλων, may not have had the sense of destroyer.

For this purpose we must begin with proposing the word in its original form. Ἄρτεμις was the name of the goddess so called in Attic or common Greek; but in Doric Greek the form of Ἄρτεμις was Ἄρταμις—just as that of Ἄρτεμισία was Ἄρταμισία, or that of Ἄρτεμίσιος, Ἄρταμίσιος: and if the Greek of Philammon of Delphi, or Philammon of Phocis or Thessaly, was more akin to the Doric than to the Attic or Ionic of later times—we may assume that the original form of the name of Artemis of his own contriving was much more probably Ἄρταμις than Ἄρτεμις.

Now this term Ἄρταμις, by merely changing the accent from Ἄρταμις to Ἄρταμῖς, would be seen to be simply the feminine form of Ἄρταμος; i. e. Ἄρταμος being the Greek for a masculine idea of a certain kind, Ἄρταμῖς would be the feminine one corresponding to it. And this word Ἄρταμος in Greek appears to have had only two senses, one primary and original, the other secondary and derivative—the former, according to the lexicons, that of a cook, the latter that of a butcher—though, according to our own view of the relation of these senses to each other, and of the natural association of two such ideas, the sense of butcher would appear to have been the primary one, and that of cook the secondary. But be this as it may; it is enough for our purpose at present that this word Ἄρταμος or Ἄρταμῖς in Greek was capable of the sense of a *butcher, laniator or laniatrix, trucidator or trucidatrix*; that is, of one kind of destroyer at least. We are entitled to argue from this fact, that it could not be incapable of the sense of a destroyer in general; and therefore that if this name was invented for the Artemis of Philammon, just at the same time and under the same circumstances as that of Ἄπόλλων for his Apollo—his Ἄρταμις might have been intended of the destroyer, in the case of the former, as much as his Ἄπόλλων in the case of the latter.

And in our opinion this is the true explanation of this name also. The Artamis of Philammon never meant any thing different in general from his Apollo. Each was alike

intended to denote the destroyer, but with the same special relation to a common subject of the destruction, in the effecting of which each was instrumental. And the Pytho, the common subject of this destruction, being the type of duration in general, it is not without a very significant meaning that while the sun, in his proper relation to the Pytho, was called simply *'Απόλλων*, or the destroyer, the moon, in the same relation, was styled *Ἄρταμις*, the destroyer too, but not in any way in general, but by cutting up, by dividing, by reducing to parts or fragments, the essence of the subject of the destruction in particular. For that is precisely the way in which the measures of time, the cyclical measures especially, applied to duration, affect its essence; breaking it up into parts and segments, and integral but distinct portions of itself, perpetually. And in bringing about this effect by means of a lunar and solar cycle of any kind, the moon is really the more important and influential element of the two. It is the moon, and not the sun, which in all such cases determines the end of one cycle and the beginning of another. It is the moon which, in the decursus of every such cycle, at stated times, returns to the sun, and not the sun which returns to the moon, and thereby determines the succession of one such cycle after another. So that, to speak in the language of the Pythian fable, if the sun, under such circumstances, must be called the *'Απόλλων* of the Pytho in general, the moon, with equal reason, must be styled the *Ἄρταμις* of the Pytho in particular; not merely the destroyer of his being in general, but the cutter up, the divider, the disintegrator of his essence in particular.

We may therefore conclude that the Pytho of the fable of Philammon was so called, because it was the type of a segment, or division, cut off from the essence of the serpent, (i. e. duration, not yet subjected to any of the measures of time,) by the joint agency of the sun and the moon, in the shape of a lunar and solar cycle; so that, in the figurative language of the fable, the Pytho, before the coming of Apollo to Delphi, was duration, not yet affected by any of the cyclical measures of itself, after that coming, was duration subjected to and measurable by the octaëteric cycle perpetually. And that the name of Apollo was given to the solar element in this

cycle, as one of the instruments of its causation—in this special sense of the destroyer of the Pytho; because whatsoever tends to fix the decursus of duration, before flowing on in the same uniform and invariable tenor, changes its nature, and so far destroys it; converts it at least from duration into time, which is duration perpetually coming to an end and perpetually beginning again. And for the same reason that the sun, as one of the elements of such a cycle, and as thus instrumental to the modification of the essence of duration in this particular way, was called the destroyer of the Pytho in general, the moon, as the other element, and as still more instrumental to the affection in question, was called the Artamis of the Pytho, the cutter up, the divider, of the essence of duration, into such segments and parts of itself as cycles, in particular.

iii. With regard to the name of Λητώ, the Doric form of that name also is Λατώ, in which too the first syllable is naturally long; and we may infer, for the same reasons as in the instance just considered, that the original form of this name likewise was Λατώ, rather than Λητώ. If then there was in the Greek language such a root or etymon as Λὰτ, we should have no more difficulty in deriving Λατώ from Λὰτ, than Πυθὼ from Πύθ. And though no such theme is actually found in the Greek at present, yet Λάθω occurs in Greek as the Doric form of Λήθω, and lateo in Latin in a sense analogous to that of λάθω in Greek. As however we have traced the Greek name of the Pytho to an Hebrew root, we need not despair of being able to trace this of Λατώ in Greek to an Hebrew original also.

For as the lexicon of Gesenius shews<sup>f</sup>, there is in the Hebrew such a verb as Laät, which *per syncope* would be exactly the same thing as Lât; and the proper sense of this verb appears to have been that of *to wrap round, to muffle up*, and through that *to hide or conceal from view*; for which reason Gesenius compares it with the Greek λάθω and the Latin lateo. The primary sense of this verb however must have been simply that of *enwrapping or encompassing round about*; its secondary only, that of *hiding or concealing from view*, as the necessary consequence of such enwrapping: and

<sup>f</sup> In voce.

in a given instance it might be used in the first of these senses, without implying or entailing the second.

Let us therefore be permitted to assume that the true etymon of the name of the Greek Λατώ, or the Latin Latona, the mother of the Apollo and the Artemis of the Greeks, according to the popular Theogony, must have been the Hebrew *Λᾱτ*, and that the name itself might have been derived in Greek from this Hebrew root, according to the same analogy as Πυθῶ from Πύθ. On this principle the radical, primary, and fundamental idea of the name of the Λατώ of Philammon, must have been that of *enwrapping, encircling, or covering round about*; and such an idea and meaning at the bottom of the word would direct us at once to the discovery of the subject denoted by it, the air or atmosphere; the same which in Hebrew was called the *rekiah*, or *expanse*, and in Greek τὸ Περιέχον; the great circumambient space between heaven and earth, filled with the breath of life, which encompasses the earth on every side, and were it but visible to the sense of sight, could be compared to nothing so fitly as to a great sheet, or mantle, enfolding and encircling the whole of the surface of the earth.

In our opinion *this* is the true explanation of this name also. The Λατώ of Philammon, in her proper relation to his Ἀπόλλων and his Ἀρταμῖς, was simply the personification of the air, this universal external covering of the earth; and in that capacity the mother of the sun and the moon. The Γένεσις ascribed to him, in all probability, was only the expansion of a general view of the origin and relations of things, such as this, with its proper mythological adjuncts and circumstances; the production of the air, or circumambient space between heaven and earth, at some proper time and in some proper way, first of all, just as scripture itself represents the beginning of the process even of the Mosaic creation, which would be the birth of his Lato; and then the appearance of the sun and the moon, at some proper time and in some proper manner also, as the creatures or productions of this intermediate and circumambient space, which would be properly the birth of the son and the daughter of his Lato.

It has been seen §, that in the scheme of the cosmogonic *Συζυγία* of Minos also, the power or principle residing in the air was personified under the name of Ἰστίη; a name in its etymon more properly Greek than this of Λατώ, but founded ultimately in the same view of the relation of the atmosphere to the earth, as a great sheet or covering, surrounding it on all sides. It is superfluous to add that, on this subject of the etymon and meaning of this name of Λατώ, the grammarians and philologists of classical antiquity give us no assistance; and that if the explanation above proposed is rejected, tradition has handed down no other in its stead.

And yet it appears to us that *this* is the best calculated to illustrate and account for even the popular belief of the parentage of the Grecian Latona, such as we may collect from the Theogonia of Hesiod<sup>h</sup>. Latona, according to him, was the sister of Asterie; and both were daughters of Κοῖος and Φοίβη, the son and daughter, themselves<sup>i</sup>, of Οὐρανὸς and Γαῖα. None of the fables of the Hesiodic Theogonia would seem to be easier of explanation than this, if Lato or Latona was originally conceived and proposed as the impersonation of the intermediate space between the heavens and the earth, the two extremes of the visible universe; and properly of the lower part of that space itself, or that which is immediately in contact with the earth. The expanse between heaven and earth to all outward appearance is divided into two great sections, an upper and a lower; the former the starry vault, the region of the fixed stars, the latter the air or atmosphere properly so called. And each of these being comprehended between the heavens and the earth, both might be conceived of and personified as ultimately the children of Uranus and Gaia, but mediately or primarily, through these two subordinate conceptions of Κοῖος and Φοίβη—the former the impersonation of number or quantity<sup>k</sup>, the latter of brightness or

§ Vol. iv. page 448.

<sup>h</sup> Vers. 404-410.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. 126-136.

<sup>k</sup> Κοῖος in the Macedonian dialect was the term for ἀριθμὸς, or number.

Cf. Eustathius, ad Od. Z. 163. 1558. 1 : Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι περὶ Ἀπόλλωνος Δηλίου, ἤγουν γεννηθέντος ἐν Δήλῳ τῇ νήσῳ, αἴνιγμα φέρεται εἰκοὺς τοῖς τοῦ Θεοκρίτου σκληροῖς, τοιοῦτον.

Ἐν φανερᾷ γενόμενῃ πάτρην δὲ μου ἄλμυρὸν ὕδωρ ἀμφὶς ἔχει· μήτηρ δ' ἔστ' ἀριθμοῖο παῖς.

ἤγουν ἐν τῇ Δήλῳ ἐγεννήθην· μητέρα δ' ἔχω Λητώ τὴν παῖδα τοῦ Κοῖου, ὃς δμῶ-

νυμὸς ἔστι τῷ παρὰ Μακεδόσι κοίφω, τουτέστι τῷ ἀριθμῷ.

quality—the former the peculiar and distinctive property of the sphere of the fixed stars, the latter of the intermediate space between that and the earth. And while the former received the name of Asterie, and was probably set forth under that as the mother of the stars in general, so might the latter receive the name of Lato, and be proposed as the mother of the sun and the moon, the only creatures or inhabitants of this intermediate space, between the starry heavens and the earth, of the nature of the stars in general, yet distinct from them in particular. Nor can it be denied that such an account of the origin of the sun and the moon as this, which made them the son and the daughter of the air or atmosphere, was as obvious at first sight, and as natural and consistent, as any which can be shewn to have occurred to the philosophers of antiquity anywhere, while they were still left to their own conjectures concerning the origin of the material universe and its component parts, without the benefit of the light which has been thrown upon it by revelation.

It would thus appear that the *Γένεσις* of Lato, Apollo, and Artamis, attributed to Philammon of Delphi, the fable of the Pytho, and the institution of the Pythian solemnity, must all have come into existence together, and all have been critically adapted to one another; which accounts for the tradition, reported by Plutarch, that this *Γένεσις*, both at first and ever after, constituted the burden of the Pythian Chorus as the principal and most characteristic part of the Pythian solemnity. It accounts also for the fact that, while his *Γένεσις* must have recognised his sun and moon in their proper and personal relation to his Lato, his Pythian fable, invented and made public at the same time, must have proposed them in their proper and personal relation to his Pytho. The true explanation of this seeming inconsistency is that, even when introducing and proposing the sun and the moon for the first time as the son and the daughter of his Lato, he was founding a festival also, which was intended to be regulated by a cycle; and it would not have suited his purpose to derive the names of the proper objects of worship in the Pythian institution from anything but their relation to the Pythian cycle. The sun and moon of his system, as the sun and daughter of

the air, might have existed from all eternity; as the solar and lunar element of his cycle, they must be supposed to have first come into existence along with that.

It is a corollary to these conclusions, that howsoever old the idea of the sun, as that of a person, might have been among the Greeks, the idea of such a personal object as the sun, under the name of Ἀπόλλων, could not have been older than the invention of the Pythian fable. It follows consequently that, numerous as were the individual Apollos of classical antiquity, and various as were their characteristic attributes, relations, and titles respectively, if they were all called by the name of Apollo, they must all have been younger than the Apollo of Philammon, and must all have borrowed their name from his. The first and oldest Apollo of the Greeks must have been the Pythian Apollo. And in like manner the prototype of every Artemis of later times must have been the Artamis of Philammon.

With respect to the popular belief of after times, which made Apollo and Artemis the children of Zeus as well as of Lato or Latona<sup>1</sup>, this representation of their parentage, it is manifest, could not possibly have made part of the Γένεσις of Philammon; if for no other reason, yet for *this*, that the Zeus of the later Theogony, as originally conceived and proposed by Minos in Crete, in every respect but that of name, was absolutely identical with the Apollo of the Γένεσις itself. Both were intended of the sun, and both almost in the same relation to something else; the sun of Minos, the Ζεὺς or Ζᾶν of his cosmogony, as the type of a cycle which, having once come into existence, was destined to continue in existence (i. e. to live) for ever, the sun of Philammon, as the destroyer of his Pytho, and therefore the efficient and formal cause of a cycle also. It was impossible therefore that the Apollo of Philammon could have been proposed in his system as the son of the Zeus of Minos, even though, before he conceived the idea of his institution, he might have heard of the Zeus of Minos, which was 38 years older than his own Apollo. And yet nothing would be more probable *a priori* than that, as the Zeus of Minos gradually superseded the rest of such conceptions elsewhere in dignity and estimation, and at last

<sup>1</sup> Hesiod, Theogonia, 917-919.

came to be acknowledged, as if by common consent, for the greatest of all, and the father of the rest of the gods, both the Apollo and the Artemis of Philammon in the course of time would be affiliated upon the Zeus of Minos. And as the easiest and most obvious mode of establishing the relation in question between them, the Zeus of Minos would be incorporated with the Γένεσις of Philammon, as the husband of Lato. And from this time forward it would be only consistent that even the Pythian Apollo, the original and independent conception of Philammon, as the owner and lord of the Delphian oracle, should be set forth and recognised, even in his prophetic capacity itself, as the vicegerent of Zeus; as merely his interpreter, mediator, or mouthpiece — in making known his oracles to men—

Διὸς προφήτης δ' ἐστὶ Λοξίας πατρός<sup>m</sup>.

SECTION VII.—*On the Oracle at Delphi, and its traditional history before the Pythian Institution.*

It is evident from the preceding accounts that when Philammon conceived the idea of his Pythian fable, and devised his Pythian cycle, and founded the Pythian festival; the end and result which he contemplated by all this preparation, the practical effect which he had in view by it, must have been to open an oracle at Delphi, i. e. a means of holding communication with the gods perpetually; to bring it at once into repute, and to give it a character of sacredness and a claim to deference and respect from the first, by placing it under the tutela, the jurisdiction and administration, of his own Apollo, as soon as he was born. Let us therefore, at this period of our inquiry into the history of his institution, consider the traditional accounts of this oracle; and what reason there may be to conclude that the Delphian oracle also could not have been older than the Pythian institution.

i. then; The city of Delphi, which surrounded the oracle, and gave it its name with posterity, was not yet in existence before the time of Philammon. Both Strabo and Pausanias have told us that the original settlement at Delphi was si-

<sup>m</sup> Eumenides, 19. cf. 614-618: also, the Hymn to Apollo, 131: to Hermes 469: 529-535: Virgil, Æneid. iii. 251.



tuated among the mountainous ridges of Parnassus, and looked down on the site of the Delphi of after times, and was called by a different name, that of *Λυκωρέια*: and Pausanias in particular has added, that this city professed to have been founded by the survivors of the flood of Deucalion, and to have been so called from the circumstance that those who escaped from that catastrophe were guided to the site of this city by the howling of wolves, retreating before the waters as well as themselves. On this principle, the etymon of the name must have been *λύκος* and *ὠρύω*. But the composition and form of the name are strikingly analogous to those of the *Λυκόσουρα* of the Arcadians, which professed to be the oldest settlement not only in Arcadia, but anywhere else; and derived its name, as we have seen<sup>n</sup>, from *λῦξ* or *λύκη*, in the sense of the light which precedes the sun, and *οὔρος* or *οὔρον*, impetus. It is far from improbable therefore that the true account of this Delphian *Λυκωρέια* also is that *this* too was the oldest settlement in that part of Greece; and founded at a time when the recollection of the deluge was still fresh in the memories of men, (or even when the deluge known as that of Deucalion was a recent event—of which coincidence more may be said hereafter,) and when consequently the highest situations were still selected for the habitations of men, in preference to those on the lower ground<sup>o</sup>. And an elevated locality, like one on the summits of mount Parnassus, (8000 feet above the level of the sea,) being naturally the first to receive the rays of the sun, and to reflect the first tokens of returning daylight—it might take its name from that circumstance, as the Mountain-*Λύκη*, the *λῦξ* or *λύκη* of the *ἽΟρέια*, or Mountain-tops. Be this however as it may, this Lycoreia of the Parnassian ridge, the first and original human settlement there, was a very different thing from the Delphi of later times, built in the hollow below, in the centre of which the oracular cavern itself was situated, and encompassing both that and the temple of the Pythian Apollo. It is manifest therefore that it must have grown up in this quarter by degrees, under the site of the ancient Lycoreia; having been attracted to this spot by the growing importance of the

<sup>n</sup> Vol. iv. page 577.<sup>o</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 247.

oracle itself. Consequently that it could not have been older than the oracle.

Εἴρηται δ' ὅτι καὶ ὁ Παρνασσὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσπερίων μερῶν ἴδρυται τῆς Φωκίδος. τούτου δὴ τὸ μὲν πρὸς δύσιν πλευρὸν οἱ Λοκροὶ κατέχουσιν οἱ Ὀζόλαι· τὸ δὲ νότιον οἱ Δελφοὶ, πετρῶδες χωρίον, θεατροειδές, κατὰ κορυφὴν ἔχον τὸ μαντεῖον, καὶ τὴν πόλιν σταδίῳ ἑκκαίδεκα τὸν κύκλον πληροῦσαν. ὑπέρκειται δ' αὐτῆς ἡ Λυκώρεια, ἐφ' οὗ τόπου πρότερον ἴδρυντο οἱ Δελφοὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· νῦν δ' ἐπ' (ὑπ') αὐτῷ οἰκοῦσι περὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Κασταλίαν. πρόκειται δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἡ Κίρφις, ἐκ τοῦ νοτίου μέρους ὄρος ἀπότομον, Νάπην ἀπολιπὸν μεταξὺ, δι' ἧς ὁ Πλειστὸς διαρρεῖ ποταμός. ὑποπέπτωκε δὲ τῇ Κίρφει πόλις ἀρχαία Κίρρα, ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάττῃ ἰδρυμένη κ', τ. λ. ρ.— Πόλιν δὲ ἀρχαιοτάτην οἰκισθῆναί φασιν ἐνταῦθα ὑπὸ Παρνασσοῦ .... ταύτην μὲν οὖν κατακλυσθῆναι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τῶν ὄμβρων τῶν κατὰ Δευκαλίωνα συμβάντων. τῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὕσσι διαφυγεῖν τὸν χειμῶνα ἠδυνήθησαν, λύκων ὠρυγαῖς ἀπεσώθησαν ἐς τοῦ Παρνασσοῦ τὰ ἄκρα ὑπὸ ἡγεμόσι τῆς πορείας τοῖς θηρίοις· πόλιν δὲ, ἣν ἔκτισαν, ἐκάλεσαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ Λυκώρειαν θ.

ii. The name of Δελφοὶ could not yet have been heard of in the time of Philammon, because it was still unknown in that of Homer. The name of Πυθῶ or Πυθῶν, as that of the oracle, or of the adjacent locality, occurs more than once in Homer<sup>r</sup>—that of Delphi neither in the Iliad nor in the Odyssey. The more ancient Hymns of Homer also recognise the name of Πυθῶ<sup>s</sup>, and mention the spring Δέλφουσα in its vicinity<sup>t</sup>—but not the name of Δελφοί\*. The name of Πυθῶ occurs thrice in Hesiod too<sup>v</sup>: but not that of Delphi. Δελφός occurs first in Æschylus, as the name of the king of the place<sup>w</sup>; Δελφοὶ is the name of the city first in a fragment of Simonides<sup>x</sup>.

\* xxvii. 14. Εἰς Ἄρτεμιν—one of the latest of them.

Δελφῶν ἐς πῖονα δῆμον

occurs.

<sup>p</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 276.

<sup>q</sup> Pausanias, x. vi. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Il. B. 519: I. 405: Od. Θ. 80:  
A. 58c.

<sup>s</sup> In Apollinem, 182. cf. 357-374.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. 243, 379.

<sup>v</sup> Theogonia, 499: Scutum, 480:  
Fragm. xxix.

<sup>w</sup> Eumenides, 16—

Δελφός τε χώρας τῆσδε πρυμνήτης ἀναξ—

On which the scholia: Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήματι Καλλιμάχου αἰτιῶν β' φησί· Μελανθοῦς τῆς Δευκαλίωνος καὶ Κηφισοῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γίνεταί Μέλαινα τοῦ-

νομα. Μελαίνης δὲ καὶ Ποσειδῶνος Δελφός, ἀφ' οὗ οἱ Δελφοὶ, ὅς ἐστι τῆς χώρας ἀναξ καὶ κυβερνήτης.

<sup>x</sup> Ixxi. 2.

iii. With respect to the etymon of the name of *Δελφοί*, Numenius, quoted by Macrobius <sup>y</sup>, appears to have derived it from *Δέλφος* in the sense of *solus, unicus*; as if it had been so called because it was singular of its kind. But, besides that this would have been false in point of fact, (inasmuch as there were many oracles, like Delphi, in the ancient world, and even in Greece, and some of them, like the oracle of Zeus on Mount Dicte, and the oracle of Pan on Mount Lykæus, if not that of Dodona also, older than the Delphian one itself.) we do not know that this word *Δέλφος* in Greek did carry with it this particular sense of unity or singularity of its kind. It is agreed however that the city of Delphi grew up about the oracle; which itself was situated in the midst of a circular basin, or amphitheatre, and in its appearance externally resembled a bowl, turned upside down, or what in Greek was called an *ὀμφαλὸς*—a round boss, or protuberance of any kind; or, still more closely perhaps, the gravid uterus—the Greek for which being *δελφὺς* <sup>z</sup>, as well as *μήτρα*, it is the most probable explanation of the name, to suppose it to have been first given to this oracular cavern, tripod or cortina, from this circumstance of its shape and form; and then, by degrees, transferred to the city, which in the course of time grew up about it.

It is well known that *Δελφοί*, according to the tradition of the ancient Greeks, passed for the centre of the *Οἰκουμένη* or habitable world; and that its proper style and title, in its supposed relation to the rest of the earth, was that of the *Γῆς ὀμφαλός*—which implies both something circular and protuberant in itself, and something central relatively to everything else of the same kind. The name of *Δελφοί* was probably not older than the invention of this fable—which could not have been known to Philammon, as it does not appear to have been known even to Homer. *Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον τιμὴ τῷ ἱερῷ τούτῳ διὰ τὸ χρηστήριον συνέβη... προσελάβετο δέ τι καὶ ἡ θέσις τοῦ τόπου. τῆς γὰρ Ἑλλάδος ἐν μέσῳ πῶς ἐστὶ τῆς συμπάσης, τῆς τε ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκτός· ἐνομίσθη δὲ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τῆς γῆς ὀμφαλὸν, πρῶσπλασταί τε καὶ μῦθον, ὃν φησι Πίνδαρος· ὅτι συμπέσοιεν ἐνταῦθα οἱ ἀετοὶ οἱ ἀφεθέντες*

<sup>y</sup> Saturn. i. xvii. 297.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Hesychius in *Δελφὺς* and *Ἄδελφοί*.

ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς· οἱ δὲ κόρακας φασι. δείκνυται δὲ καὶ ὀμφαλός τις ἐν τῷ ναῷ τεταινωμένος, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ αἱ δύο εἰκόνες τοῦ μύθου<sup>a</sup>.

iv. With respect to the oracle itself; There must always have been in the Delphian basin a natural cavity, of a circular shape and of considerable depth, and filled with a vapour, possessed of peculiar properties—the nature and effects of which might or might not have been experimentally known before the time of Philammon, and yet not have been actually applied, for the purpose of vaticination, by any before him. The history of this oracular cavern, and of its vaticinatory exhalations, as handed down by tradition, appears to have been *this*; That it was first created, and endowed with its prophetic capabilities, by Γῆ, or the Earth—but, as to any subsequent application of these to their proper use, or any positive connection between this natural oracle and any of the objects of actual worship among mankind, (i. e. among the Greeks,) of those which were older than the divinities of the classical Olympus, it was never associated with any but two, Θέμις and Φοῖβη, both belonging to the ante-Olympian order and dynasty of the Titans—and among the gods of Olympus, never with any but three, Ποσειδῶν, Διόνυσος, and Ἀπόλλων—each of whom, as we know, came into being one before and one after another, Ποσειδῶν first, 30 years before Διόνυσος, and Διόνυσος next, eight years before Ἀπόλλων. But as to the history of the oracle, as practically available for the benefit of mankind, tradition is uniform that it was never applied to that use and purpose until it passed into the hands of Apollo\*; and the first prophetess of whom tradi-

\* And this is in fact the same thing as saying that the oracle itself had no existence until it became the property of Apollo. It is very observable however that, even as supposed to have belonged to former proprietors, of the same order and class of beings as Apollo himself, tradition should have represented it as having belonged successively to no two, before and distinct from Apollo, but the Ποσειδῶν and the Διόνυσος of classical antiquity. These two were in fact the only two of the gods or goddesses of the classical Olympus, that were really older in the Peloponnese in general, or that part of it in particular, which was over against or contiguous to Delphi, than the Apollo of the classical Olympus also. We shall see

<sup>a</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 278 b.

<sup>b</sup> Supra, vol. iv. p. 414 sqq.

tion had preserved the memory, as instrumental in conveying responses to mankind, was Φημορόη, the first priestess of the Pythian Apollo himself. All this may justly be considered to tend to one conclusion, viz. That Apollo, his oracle, and his πρόμαντις or priestess, came into being together, and none of them was older than the Pythian fable, nor consequently than the inventor of the fable, Philammon.

i. Φασὶ δ' εἶναι τὸ μαντεῖον ἄντρον κοῖλον κατὰ βάθους, οὐ μάλα εὐρύστομον· ἀναφέρεσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐιθουσιαστικόν· ὑπερκείσθαι δὲ τοῦ στομίον τρίποδα ὑψηλόν, ἐφ' οὗ τὴν Πυθίαν ἀναβαίνουσαν, δεχομένην τὸ πνεῦμα, ἀποθροεσπίζειν ἔμμετρά τε καὶ ἄμετρα ... πρώτην δὲ Φημορόην φασὶ γενέσθαι Πυθίαν κ', τ. λ.<sup>c</sup>

ii. Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῆδε πρεσβεύω θεῶν  
τὴν πρωτόμαντιν Γαίαν· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Θέμιν,  
ἣ δὴ τὸ μητρὸς δευτέρα τόδ' ἔζητο  
μαντεῖον, ὡς λόγος τις· ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ  
λάχει, θελούσης, οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν τινός,  
Τιτανίς ἄλλη παῖς χθονὸς καθέζετο  
Φοίβη· δίδωσι δ' ἣ γενέθλιον δόσιν  
Φοίβω, τὸ Φοίβης δ' ὄνομα ἔχει παρώνυμον.  
κ', τ. λ.<sup>d</sup>

iii. Ἔρχεται τοίνυν εἰς Δελφοὺς ὁ Ἀπόλλων, Πυθῶνι τὰς βοῦς  
νέμων ..... εἶτα ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὸ μαντεῖον, ἐν ᾧ πρώτη Νύξ ἐχρη-  
σμήθησεν, εἶτα Θέμις. Πυθῶνος δὲ τότε κυριεύσαντος τοῦ προφη-  
τικῆ τρίποδος, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτος Διόνυσος θέμερίστευσε<sup>e</sup> κ', τ. λ.

iv. Λέγεται δὲ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ διάφορα ἐς αὐτοὺς τοὺς Δελφοὺς,  
πλείω δὲ ἔτι ἐς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ μαντεῖον. φασὶ γὰρ δὴ τὰ  
ἀρχαιότατα Γῆς εἶναι τὸ χρηστήριον, καὶ Δάφνην ἐπ' αὐτῷ τετά-

hereafter that the worship of Ποσειδῶν was actually introduced into this quarter of the Peloponnese, by the sons of Actor and Molione, Eurytus and Cteatus, before that of Zeus was by Hercules; and we have seen already that the worship of Ποσειδῶν maintained its ascendancy in this quarter in particular, in spite of the Olympic Zeus, down to the time of the Ionic migration at least. We have seen too that the worship of Dionysos was introduced at Argos, and in its vicinity, within ten years of the introduction of that of Zeus at Olympia. With reason then might the authors of this traditionary history of the Delphian oracle in later times have represented it as, at different times, the property of two only of the gods of the same order and class as the Hellenic Apollo, yet older than he; and these two the Hellenic Posidon and Dionysos.

<sup>c</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 277.

<sup>d</sup> Æschylus, Eumcnides, i.

<sup>e</sup> Argumentum Pythium Primum.

χθαι πρόμαντιν ὑπὸ τῆς Γῆς· εἶναι δὲ αὐτὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ὄρος Νυμφῶν. ἔστι δὲ ἐν Ἑλληνισι ποιήσις, ὄνομα μὲν τοῖς ἔπεσιν ἔστιν Εὐμολπία, Μουσαίῳ δὲ τῷ Ἀντιοφήμου προσποιούσι τὰ ἔπη. πεποιημένον οὖν ἔστιν ἐν τούτοις Ποσειδῶνος ἐν κοινῷ καὶ Γῆς εἶναι τὸ μαντεῖον, καὶ τὴν μὲν χρᾶν αὐτὴν, Ποσειδῶνι δὲ ὑπηρέτην ἐς τὰ μαντεύματα εἶναι Πύρκωνα· καὶ οὕτως ἔχει τὰ ἔπη.

Αὐτίκα δὲ χθονίης σφῶν δὴ πιτυτὸν φάτε μῦθον,  
σὺν δέ τε Πύρκων ἀμφίπολος κλυτοῦ Ἐννοσιγαίου.

χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον ὅσον τῇ Γῇ μετῆν· δοθῆναι Θέμιδι ὑπ' αὐτῆς λέγουσιν· Ἀπόλλωνα δὲ παρὰ Θέμιδος λαβεῖν δωρεάν, Ποσειδῶνι δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ μαντείου Καλαύρειαν ἀντιδοῦναι φασιν αὐτὸν τὴν πρὸ Τροιζῆνος<sup>f</sup>. ἤκουσα δὲ καὶ ὡς ἄνδρες ποιμαίνοντες ἐπιτύχοιεν τῷ μαντείῳ· καὶ ἐνθεοί τε ἐγένοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀτμοῦ καὶ ἐμαντεύσαντο ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος. μεγίστη δὲ καὶ παρὰ πλείστων ἐς Φημονόην δόξα ἐστίν, ὡς πρόμαντις γένοιτο ἡ Φημονόη τοῦ θεοῦ πρώτη, καὶ πρώτη τὸ ἐξάμετρον ἦσε κ', τ. λ. ε

## CHAPTER II.

*On the recovery of the Epoch of the Pythian Institution, and the Pythian Cycle, of Philammon.*

SECTION I.—*On the Epoch, in terms of the Month. Sacredness of the Seventh day among the ancient Greeks, and the reason on which it was founded.*

We have already seen reason to conclude that the birth of Philammon, according to the statements of antiquity, requires to be dated about B. C. 1272; and consequently, if he was a real historical character, that nothing, which there was good cause for ascribing to him within 40 or 50 years of that date, would be inconsistent with his actual time. We have seen still better reason for concluding that the principal events of his history, his Pythian fable, his Pythian institution, and his Pythian cycle, must have come into existence

<sup>f</sup> Cf. Harpocration, Καλαυρία: Phot. Lex. Καλαυρεία: Steph. Byz. in voce.  
ε Pausanias, x. v. 3.

together. The date of the birth of his Apollo at least could not have been any thing different from that of the contest of this Apollo with his Pytho, nor that of this contest from that of the Pythian institution, nor that of the Pythian institution from that of the Pythian cycle; so that, if the date of the birth of his Apollo can be determined, that of all the rest of these different particulars in one and the same series of events will be determined also.

Now with respect to this determination, if we may only assume that the Apollo of Philammon was the oldest conception of its kind among the ancient Greeks, the date of the birth of this Apollo, (in the common opinion and belief at least.) may be inferred from the uniform tenor of Grecian tradition to this *one* effect, that the Hellenic Apollo, whatsoever the view of his nature and relations in other respects, under which he was regarded, and whatsoever his proper style and title, as accommodated to that view, was born on the *seventh* day of the month. Tradition, we say, among the ancient Greeks was invariable, that their own Apollo was born on the *seventh* of some month; from which we cannot but draw the inference that, if every conception of this kind was younger than that of Philammon, and every other so called borrowed its proper name from that of Philammon, the Apollo of Philammon also must have been born on the *seventh* of some month; and consequently that the date of the contest of his Apollo with his Pytho, the date of the death of his Pytho, the date of his Pythian cycle, and the date of his first Pythian festival, all being the same with the date of the birth of his Apollo, must have been the seventh of the month, and the seventh of the same month.

This traditionary date of the birth of the Hellenic Apollo is authenticated by another well-attested fact, that of the sacredness of the seventh day among the ancient Greeks. That the seventh day, for some reason or other, must have been accounted sacred among them would be known from testimony, though nothing had also been known of the reputed birth of their own Apollo on the same day. But when we know from an uniform tradition to that effect, that the seventh day was believed by the Greeks to have been the

birthday of their own Apollo, we perceive in the fact of that belief a sufficient reason why the seventh day should have come to be accounted among them as an holy day. The birth of their own Apollo on this day could not fail to make this day, in their opinion, sacred above all days. We may appeal therefore to the universal concurrence of the Greeks in this estimation of the seventh day, as a confirmation of the popular belief among them of the birth of their own Apollo on that day; and we may argue from this fact, as before, that if the Hellenic Apollo was supposed to have been born on that day, the Apollo of Philammon must have been born on the seventh day too.

The Christian fathers and the apologists of Christianity in the first ages of the Gospel, being well aware of the fact of this traditionary reverence of the seventh day among the Greeks, are often found reasoning from it as the testimony of tradition to the institution and observance of the primitive seventh day, and as a confirmation of the sacredness of character, entailed on the seventh day from the first, by its place in the hebdomadal cycle. And Christian writers on the same subject, at the present day, are apt to reason from the same matter of fact exactly to the same effect. And indeed had nothing been handed down, in relation to this point, except the simple fact that the seventh day always had been, and still was, accounted sacred among the Greeks of old, it would not have been easy to prove that the fathers were mistaken in the construction which they put on this fact, and the inference which they drew from it. But handed down as it has been, not that the *seventh* day *absolutely*, but the *seventh* day of the *month* was accounted sacred among them, and that their own Apollo also (one of the greatest and holiest of their gods) was born, not on the seventh day *absolutely*, but on the seventh day of the *month*—every one must see that if the sacredness of the seventh day among the ancient Greeks is attested by one of these traditions, the reason of that estimation is assigned in the other—viz. the birth of the Grecian Apollo on that day. The birth of the Grecian Apollo on any day of the hebdomadal cycle would have made a sacred day of that one day of the cycle; and the supposed



sanctity of this one day, in the opinion of the Greeks of old, would still have had to be accounted for, by the supposed coincidence of the birth of their own Apollo upon it. But as to this further question of the traditionary knowledge of the hebdomadal cycle, or the traditionary respect and observance of the seventh day of that cycle, among the Greeks of old, we have nothing to add to the observations which we made on that subject in our *Fasti Catholici*<sup>h</sup>, except the indirect testimony which may perhaps be considered implied in the epoch of the Parthenian ennead among the ancient Bœotians<sup>i</sup>, or in the mystical number of the Heliadæ among the ancient Rhodians<sup>k</sup>. And, in our opinion, the only true evidence of the former existence and recognition of the hebdomadal division of the noctidiurnal cycle, among the ancient Greeks in particular, to which we could appeal with confidence at present, is the undoubted fact of the decadal division of the same cycle among them also; which was very probably sometime or other purposely substituted for the hebdomadal, as better adapted to the nature and constitution of the primitive equable month.

These testimonies of Grecian antiquity to the sacredness of the seventh day in particular, distribute themselves into two classes; one, such as vouch for the fact of this estimation of the seventh day, *per se*, another, of those which vouch first of all for the birth of Apollo on the seventh day, and for the sacredness of the day itself, by virtue of that coincidence. We shall produce both; but it will now be understood that, though apparently different, and in their *prima facie* drift and tendency actually so, they are virtually the same, and both conspire to the same proof of the birth of Apollo on the seventh day, in the first instance, and of the sacredness of the seventh day on that account, in the next. The most complete collection of the testimonies of the former class is found in Clemens Alexandrinus; and though it comprehends some, of the genuineness and antiquity of which we may well be permitted to doubt, we shall exhibit all of them exactly as we find them either in him, or in any other of our authorities which may have repeated them after him.

<sup>h</sup> *Fasti Catholici*, i. 409.<sup>i</sup> Vol. iv. *supra*, page 358.<sup>k</sup> Vol. iv. page 280.

i. Ἄλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐβδόμην ἱερὰν οὐ μόνον οἱ Ἑβραῖοι ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες ἴσασιν<sup>1</sup>. . . Ἡσίοδος μὲν οὕτως περὶ αὐτῆς λέγει·

Πρῶτον ἔην τετράς τε καὶ ἐβδόμη ἱερὸν ἡμαρ.

καὶ πάλιν·

Ἐβδομάτῃ δ' αὖθις λαμπρὸν φάος ἡελίοιο.

Ἵομηρος δέ·

Ἐβδομάτῃ δῆπεια κατήλυθεν ἱερὸν ἡμαρ.

καί·

Ἐβδόμη ἦν ἱερή.

καὶ πάλιν·

Ἐβδομον ἡμαρ ἔην καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα.

καὶ αὖθις·

Ἐβδομάτῃ δ' ἡοῖ λίπομεν ῥόον ἐξ Ἀχέροντος.

ναλ μῆν καὶ Καλλιμάχος ὁ ποιητῆς γράφει·

Ἐβδομάτῃ δ' ἡοῖ καὶ οἱ τετύκοντο ἅπαντα.

καὶ πάλιν·

Ἐβδόμη εἰν ἀγαθοῖσι καὶ ἐβδόμη ἐστὶ γενέθλη.

καί·

Ἐβδόμη ἐν πρώτοισι καὶ ἐβδόμη ἐστὶ τελείη.

καί·

Ἐπτά δὲ πάντα τέτυκτο ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστερόεντι  
ἐν κύκλοισι φανέντ' ἐπιτελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς\*.

\* Among the above quotations from Homer, none is found at present in the Iliad or the Odyssey, but the third; and even that, not as there given,

Ἐβδομον ἡμαρ ἔην καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα—

but in the form of

Τέτρατον ἡμαρ ἔην καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα.

Odyss. E. 262.

We hope however to produce proof hereafter of the sanctity attached to the seventh day, and of the reason on which it was founded, in one unquestionable instance, which occurs in Homer himself. And, in addition to this, there are three passages at least, in the Odyssey, from which it may be collected, that when anything more important than usual was to be done, or undertaken, the seventh day, for some reason or other, was selected for that purpose, in preference to any other.

i. Ἐξῆμαρ μὲν ἔπειτα ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι  
δαινυντ' Ἡελίοιο βοῶν ἐλάσαντες ἀρίστας·  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔβδομον ἡμαρ ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε Κρονίων.

κ', τ. λ.

M. 397-399.

Here the *seventh* day was purposely selected for the resumption of the

<sup>1</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. v. xiv. § 108, tom. iii. pag. 76. cf. Eusebius, Præparatio Evang. xiii. 12. 317, 318: 13. 337, 338.

ii. Ἦματα μὲν τρὶς ἔφ' ἑπτὰ βῆν Ἑλένοιο πέπυσμαι  
θηλυτέρης τε λέχος φεύγειν καὶ κοινὰ λότερα,  
καὶ μίμνεν ἀμίαντον ἔδωδῆς ἐμψύχοιο<sup>m</sup>.

iii. Καὶ μάρτυς Ὀρφεὺς λέγων οὕτως·  
Ἐβδόμη ἦν ἐφίλησεν ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων<sup>n</sup>.  
Πρῶτον ἔνη τετράς τε καὶ ἐβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ·  
τῇ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα γείνατο Δητῶ<sup>o</sup>—

Μετὰ δὲ ταύτην (the triakās or 30th) ἀπὸ τῆς νομηνιας ἀρξάμενος ἐπαυεῖ τὰς τρεῖς, τὴν ἔνην (οὕτως καλῶν τὴν νομηνίαν παρὰ τὸ ἐν), τὴν τετράδα, τὴν ἐβδόμην, καὶ πάσας ἱερὰς λέγων, τὴν (δὲ) ἐβδόμην καὶ ὡς Ἀπόλλωνος γειέθλιον ὑμῶν· διὸ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ταύτην ὡς Ἀπολλωνιακὴν τιμῶσι, δαφνηφοροῦντες καὶ τὸ κανοῦν ἀποστρέφοντες καὶ ὑμνοῦντες τὸν θεόν<sup>p</sup>—Φιλόχορος δὲ. ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡμερῶν, ἡλίου καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος λέγει αὐτὴν (τὴν ἔνην)· ἡ δὲ (τετράς) Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ἐρμού ἐστιν<sup>r</sup>. ἡ δὲ ἐβδόμη ἱερὰ Ἀπόλλωνος· ἐν αὐτῇ γὰρ ἐτέχθη. διὸ καὶ ἐπτάτονος αὐτοῦ ἡ κιθάρα<sup>s</sup>.

iv. Τὰς δ' ἐβδόμας ὁ σεμνὸς ἐβδομαγέτας  
ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων εἴλετ<sup>t</sup>—

Τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα λέγει, ὃς ἐν ἐβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς γεννηθεὶς ἐκλήθη ἐβδομαγέτας.... ἐβδόμη γὰρ ἐγεννήθη Ἀπόλλων<sup>v</sup>—Καὶ τὸν θεὸν ὡς ταύτῃ γενόμενον ὑμεῖς....οἱ προφητῆται καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐβδο-

voyage; and that it was the seventh of the month may be inferred from M. 325.

ii. Ἐξῆμαρ μὲν ἔπειτα ἐμοὶ ἐρήρης ἐταῖροι  
δαίνυντ'....  
ἐβδομάτῃ δ' ἀναβάντες ἀπὸ Κρήτης εὐρείης  
κ', τ. λ. Ξ. 249.

Here too the seventh day was purposely chosen as the fittest on which to begin this voyage to Egypt—and, as it appears from verse 244, here also the seventh of the month.

iii. Ἐξῆμαρ μὲν ὁμῶς πλέομεν νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμαρ·  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔβδομον ἡμαρ ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε Κρονίων,  
τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα γυναικα βάλ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα.  
O. 476.

And this seventh day too, it may very probably be collected from verse 455, was the seventh of the first month of the new year.

<sup>m</sup> Orpheus, *Λιθικά*, 360.

<sup>n</sup> Lydus, *de Mensibus*, ii. 11. p. 24.

15. <sup>o</sup> Hesiod, *Opp. et Dies*, 768.

<sup>p</sup> Schol. in loc. Procli.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. Vol. i. page 266.

<sup>s</sup> Schol. in loc. cf. Moschopulus, ad 768.

<sup>t</sup> Septem contra Thebas, 800.

<sup>v</sup> Schol. in loc.

μαγέτην καλείτε<sup>x</sup>—Ἡ γὰρ ἐννεὰς δὴ που ταῖς Μούσαις ἡ δὲ ἐβδο-  
μὰς τῷ Μουσηγέτῃ προσκεκλήρωται<sup>y</sup>—Ἡ γὰρ ἱερὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος  
ἐβδομὰς ἀναλώσει τὴν ἡμέραν πρότερον ἢ λόγῳ τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτῆς  
ἀπάσας διεξελθεῖν<sup>z</sup>—Τοῦν τετράδι<sup>a</sup> . . . .” Ἐξω τῶν ἑορτῶν ἱεραὶ  
τινες τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέραι νομίζονται Ἀθήνησι θεοῖς τισιν, οἶον νουμη-  
νία καὶ ἐβδόμη Ἀπόλλωνι . . . ἐκάστου γὰρ μηνὸς ἡ νουμηνία καὶ ἡ  
ἐβδόμη ἀφιέρωτο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι—Ὁ δὲ Ἐβδόμην (τινὰ εἶπεν), ὅτι  
ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες ἐν ταῖς ἐβδόμαις κἀκείνος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις  
ἔπαιζε<sup>b</sup>.

v. Ἡ μὲν ἔφη κύκνοι δὲ θεοῦ μέλποντες αἰδοὶ  
Μηόνιον Πακτωλὸν ἐκυκλώσαντο λιπόντες  
ἐβδομάκις περὶ Δῆλον· ἐπήισαν δὲ λοχείῃ  
Μουσῶν ὄρνιθες αἰοιδότατοι πετεηνῶν.  
ἔνθεν ὁ παῖς τοσσάσδε λύρη ἐνεδήσατο χορδὰς  
ὑστερον, ὅσσοι κύκνοι ἐπ’ ὠδίνεσσιν ἄεισαν.  
ὄγδοον οὐκ ἔτ’ ἄεισαν, ὁ δ’ ἔκθορε κ’, τ. λ.<sup>c</sup>

Ἑπταμηνιαῖος γὰρ ἐτέχθη ὁ Ἀπόλλων<sup>d</sup>.

vii. Νεομηνίας δὲ ἀνὰ πάσας καὶ ἐβδόμας ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς  
δίδοσθαι ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἱρήϊον τέλειον ἐκατέρῳ ἐς Ἀπόλλωνος  
κ’, τ. λ.<sup>e</sup>—Ἐξ οὗ δὴ Περσικὴν ἔχων στολὴν (the serjeant or ar-  
paritor at Crotona) περιέρχεται ταῖς ἐβδόμαις τοὺς βωμοὺς μετὰ  
τοῦ πρυτάνεως· οὐ τρυφῆς χάριν οὐδ’ ὑβρεως, ἀλλ’ ἐπηρείας τῆς εἰς  
τοὺς Πέρσας, τοῦτο πράττοντες<sup>f</sup>.

viii. Ἀπόλλωνος γὰρ ἱερὰ πᾶσα νουμηνία, καθὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ σελη-  
ναίου μηνὸς ἐβδόμη ὡς γενέθλιος Ἀπόλλωνος<sup>g</sup>.

SECTION II.—*Traditionary date of the birth of Apollo, whether  
the seventh of the lunar, or the seventh of the solar, month.*

These testimonies are competent to vouch for the supposi-  
tion of the birth of the Grecian Apollo on the seventh of the  
month, and for the consequent sacredness of that day, ever  
after. But as the seventh of the month may be either the  
seventh of the solar, or the seventh of the lunar month, and

<sup>x</sup> Plutarch, *Symposiaca*, viii. i. 2.

<sup>y</sup> *Ibid.* ix. iii. 1.

<sup>z</sup> *De Ei Delphico*, xvii.

<sup>a</sup> Scholia in Plutum, 1127.

<sup>b</sup> Lucian, *Opp.* iii. 174. Pseudolo-  
gista, 16. 83.

<sup>c</sup> Callimachus, *Hymnus in Delum*,  
249.

<sup>d</sup> Schol. in loc. A mistaken gloss.  
The true reason was, because Apollo

was born on the seventh day; and it  
took these swans seven days to fly seven  
times round Delos—during all of which  
the *λοχεία* in particular was going on,  
but not yet completed.

<sup>e</sup> Herodotus, vi. 57. of the privileges  
or rights of the kings at Sparta.

<sup>f</sup> Athenæus, xii. 22. E Timæo.

<sup>g</sup> Scholia vulg. ad *Odyss.* φ. 258.

in a particular instance must be one or the other, or both, the question still remains, which of the two was meant in this instance by the birth of the Grecian Apollo on the seventh of the month? or whether it is to be understood of his birth on both at once?

The first observation which may be made on this question is, That though the seventh of the month, as the traditionary birthday of the Grecian Apollo, might have been intended originally of the seventh of the solar month, it is no objection that according to most of the preceding testimonies it is obviously to be understood of the seventh of the lunar. The explanation of this apparent anomaly is that all these testimonies are later than the transition of the solar calendar into the lunar, and depose to the state of the case in their own time, when the old solar dates, in repeated instances, were still nominally the same in the lunar calendar. The just inference from this fact is that, if the birthday of Apollo was still nominally the seventh of the month in the lunar calendar, it must have been originally the seventh of the month in the solar also.

But with respect to this question in general, Whether the traditionary birthday of Apollo, as the seventh of the month from the first, was the seventh of the solar, or the seventh of the lunar, month; in the first place, there was no form of the civil month, among the Greeks, in the time of Philammon, but the equable solar month; and consequently none from which this day could have been taken but that. In the next place, the Apollo of Philammon was the type of the sun, and through that of the solar year; and it would have been incongruous to that view of his nature in himself, and of his proper relation to any of the measures of time, to have taken a date so important to his personal individuality, as that of his birth, from any of those measures but the solar month. It is no difficulty that even in this view of his nature and relations the Apollo of Philammon was associated from the first with the Artamis of Philammon also, and that both entered his system in conjunction, as the representatives of the solar and the lunar element combined in his cycle respectively. His Apollo was still the impersonation of the masculine form of those elements; the moon only of the

feminine; and it would have been inconsistent with his proper character and personal individuality to have supposed him related to the seventh of the lunar more than to the seventh of the solar month. Thirdly, the Artamis of Philammon, the proper type of the lunar element in his cycle, though necessarily associated with his Apollo in the joint effect of the agency of both, that of making the Pytho of his fable (i. e. his octaëteric cycle) out of the essence of the Serpent (i. e. Duration not yet subjected to any of the measures of time), yet not being formally and distinctly recognised as an independent agent, if she was really included in the œconomy of his fable, it must have been under the person of his Apollo; and if she really contributed her share to what was supposed to be constantly done in every cycle, it must have been as included in the agency of his Apollo. The Apollo of Philammon therefore in his fable represented the Artamis also; and consequently the proper birthday of his Apollo must have been that of his Artamis too: and if the former was the seventh of the solar month, so was the latter: if the latter was the seventh of the lunar month, so was the former: i. e. the birthday of each, under the circumstances of the case, was both the seventh of the solar and the seventh of the lunar month alike.

The actual state of the case in the Γένεσις of Philammon, in our opinion, was originally conformed to this hypothesis, that his Apollo and his Artamis, his sun and his moon, the son and the daughter of the same mother, his Lato or the air—in reality were twins, both born on the same day, and that same day the seventh of the month, and that seventh of the month both the seventh of the solar and the seventh of the lunar month alike. The tradition of later times recognised the two children of Latona indeed in the relation of twins—and so far adhered to the original Γένεσις of Philammon; but in the dates and order of their birth it made a distinction, which we need not hesitate to pronounce a deviation from, and therefore a corruption of, his account in that respect, viz. that of supposing the birth of Artemis on the sixth of the month, and that of Apollo on the seventh. It is almost self-evident that this could not have been the original representation of these things according to Philammon. His

sun and his moon, as the twin children of his Lato, must both have been born at once : and, as the Types and Impersonations of the solar and the lunar momenta of his cycle respectively, they must have come into being under similar circumstances, both on the solar epoch of his cycle, whatsoever that was, and both on the lunar, whatsoever that too was, alike.

SECTION III.—*On the Epoch in terms of the Year. Fable of the Dragon and the Sparrows in Homer, and the historical fact implied thereby.*

The portent which Homer supposes to have occurred in the presence of the Greeks assembled at Aulis, just before they set out on the expedition to Troy<sup>h</sup>, it is agreed, could have been only a poetical fiction, founded on the historical fact, that the siege of Troy was known to have lasted nine years, and the city to have been taken in the tenth. It occurred to all the commentators of antiquity to see that the nine sparrows, devoured by the dragon in this fable, denoted those nine years of the war, swallowed up and consumed by the siege—but it did not occur to any of them, so far as we know, to remark the distinction among these nine sparrows themselves, which appears on the face of the account, and to draw the proper inference from it ; viz. that these nine sparrows were made up of so many young ones, and the parent bird over and above—that these young ones were *communis generis inter se*, but the old bird was singular of its kind ; that those young ones, all resembling each other, were eight in number, and that eight was the proper number of years in the Octaëteric cycle—that both those, and the dam, were devoured by the same serpent indeed, but after a certain order, first the young ones, and then the parent bird ; that the serpent which devoured them all was exhibited in the form of a dragon, a type and similitude which the Pythian fable itself, along with the light thrown upon its meaning by the Pythian institution and the Pythian cycle, must have determined long before the time of Homer to the sense of duration in the form of a cycle of some kind or other.

In short, it has never occurred to any of the commentators

<sup>h</sup> Iliad. B. 301 sqq.

on Homer, ancient or modern, to suspect that this fable must have been founded on a matter of fact, handed down by tradition, and well known in the time of Homer, that the expedition to Troy set sail in the *first* year of one cycle of this kind, and the city was taken in the second year of the next in order to it; and that the siege itself lasted nine years between, during the whole of which it was still going on, and still without success. And yet *this* is the true explanation of the fable; and so simple too, and so apposite to the circumstances of the case, that it requires only to be stated, to command the assent of every unprejudiced judgment.

The serpent was the type of time, in the form of the Octaëteric cycle. The eight young sparrows, the first to be devoured by this serpent, were the type of an entire and perfect cycle of this kind, destined to be swallowed up by time in the prosecution of the siege of Troy. The parent sparrow, the last of the number devoured by the serpent, was the type of a cycle of the same kind too, but a broken and imperfect one, the next in order to the entire and complete one, already swallowed up in the siege—a cycle, supposed to be thus prematurely terminated, after the lapse of its first year, because it was not destined to go on, like the one which preceded it, in the same way of unavailing and fruitless efforts for the capture of Troy, beyond that first year.

And this explanation serves also as the clue to the meaning of the concluding circumstance of the fable, the most remarkable, and at first sight, the most inexplicable of all; viz. that even the serpent, after devouring not only the eight young ones previously, but this one old bird of the same kind, directly after, was itself turned into stone; and thereby rendered incapable of devouring any longer. This representation is intelligible, if the nine symbols of the portent were the nine terms of two consecutive Octaëteric cycles, beginning with, and proceeding parallel to, the first nine years of the war—the nine years of the siege—i. e. of useless and unavailing warfare; in which case, if they began in the first year of one such cycle, they must stop short with the first year of the next to it. And if the same serpent was the type of each of these cycles, supposed to be continuous, the devouring power of this serpent, which began to be exerted in



the first year of the first of these cycles, must cease to be exerted after the first of the second. It must live and be active for the whole of the first of these cycles, and for the first year of the second; but no longer. And this unexpected consummation, affecting the serpent at last, as much as the fate of the nine birds previously devoured by it one after another, conspires to the same moral or inference; viz. that those nine birds must have been the nine years of two Octaëteric cycles, the last of which coincided with the ninth year of the siege of Troy, and the serpent, which first devoured them all and then was turned into stone itself, must have been the common type of both these cycles — of the first, as a perfect one of its kind, of the second, as one cut short and brought to an end before its time. And the conclusion deducible from this representation, with respect to the matter of fact on which it must have been founded, will be the same in either case, viz. That the war of Troy, which lasted nine years before the capture of the city, was known to have lasted one Octaëteric cycle complete and one year more of another, and therefore to have begun in the first year of one such cycle, and to have ended in the second of the next.

The question therefore, which we have to consider next, is *this*; What Octaëteric cycle could this have been? What well known cycle of that kind, as old among the Greeks as the Trojan expedition, or even older, could thus have defined the chronology of the war at the time, and have supplied the means of handing it down to posterity ever after? And if there were at this time only two such cycles among them, of sufficient importance as a standard of reference for the chronology of passing events, the cycle of Minos in Crete, which came into existence along with his Zeus, and the cycle of Philammon at Delphi, which came into being along with his Apollo; the answer to this question must be obvious\*.

\* The Panathenaic cycle of Theseus also was a few years older than the beginning of the war of Troy, dated from B. C. 1200, or 1199. But for the purpose of the argument in the text, this may be considered the same with the Pythian cycle itself. The Panathenaic cycle of Theseus and the Pythian cycle of Philammon were commensurable, with this dif-

The Octaëteric correction of Minos was certainly older than that of Philammon; but if this latter too was actually in existence before the Trojan expedition, and what is more, already consecrated before that event to the worship of the Pythian Apollo, to the use of the Pythian oracle, and to the regulation of the Pythian solemnity, it is easy to see which of the two must have appeared the most important, and the most interesting nationally, to the confederate Greeks, none of whom, except Idomeneus, came from Crete—and in terms of which of the two so remarkable a coincidence as this of the sailing of the expedition and the beginning of the siege in the first year of one of these cycles, and that of the capture of Troy and the return of the expedition in the second year of the next, would be most likely *a priori* to be perpetuated. It appears in fact from Homer himself, not only that the Pythian oracle was in existence, and in possession of its proper credit and authority as a recognised mode of communication with the gods, before the Trojan æra, but that it must have been consulted (and by Agamemnon in person) on this very subject of the expedition itself. For thus does he speak of that fact in his account of the song of Demodocus.

Ἀὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο,  
 Μοῦσ' ἄρ' αἰοιδὸν ἀνήκεν αἰεϊδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν,  
 οἰμῆς τῆς τότ' ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἴκανε,  
 νεῖκος Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλείδεω Ἀχιλῆος,  
 ὧς ποτε δηρίσαντο, θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλείῃ,  
 ἐκπάγλοις ἐπέεσσιν' ἄναξ δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
 χαῖρε νόφ, ὅτ' ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόωντο.  
 ὧς γὰρ οἱ χρείων μυθήσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων

ference only, that the former took its rise in the last month but one of the last year of the latter. The epoch of the third Pythian cycle of Philammon was August 26, B. C. 1206: that of the first Panathenaic cycle was July 20, B. C. 1206 also. See Vol. iv. Diss. i. page 52 sqq.

This Panathenaic cycle of Theseus however at the beginning of the Trojan war, dated B. C. 1200, was only six years old; and even at the sailing of the expedition, B. C. 1190, was only 16 years old. It was not likely to have become generally known among the rest of the Greeks in so short a time. And not having been connected with any such national institution as the Pythian oracle, though it might have had an interest for the Athenians in particular above any other of the same time, it could have had none for the Greeks in general.

Πυθοῖ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ, ὅθ' ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδὸν  
 χρησόμενος· τότε γάρ ῥα κυλίνδετο πῆματος ἀρχή  
 Τρῶσί τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς<sup>i</sup>.

And this it seems was at the very beginning of the expedition; i. e. according to the Homeric chronology of the war, eight years, or one Octaëteric cycle, before the expedition actually sailed. It may be observed also, in reference to this tradition of the consultation of the oracle by Agamemnon, before the expedition was undertaken, that even in the latest times a plane tree was pointed out at Delphi, said to have been planted there by him<sup>k</sup>; as well as another at Caphyæ, planted either by him or by Menelaus<sup>l</sup>. And besides this visit of Agamemnon's, at a time when the expedition had been only recently set on foot, the memory of another of Menelaus' and Ulysses' in conjunction, at a much later period, when the preparations for the expedition were now complete, and the fleet was only waiting at Aulis for a favourable wind, appears to have been perpetuated also. The Scholiast on the Odyssey at least<sup>m</sup> relates the following fact, on the authority of Demetrius Phalereus: Οὕτω Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεύς: Μειέλαος ἄμα τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ ἐλθὼν εἰς Δελφοὺς τὸν θεὸν εἶρετο περὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἔσσεσθαι εἰς Ἴλιον στρατείας. τότε δὴ καὶ τὸν ἐννεατηρικὸν τῶν Πυθίων ἀγῶνα ἀγωνοθετεῖ Κρέων· ἐνίκα δὲ Δημοδόκος Λάκων, μαθητῆς Αὐτομήδους Μυκηναίου, ὃς ἦν πρῶτος δι' ἐπῶν γράψας τὴν Ἀμφιτρωνῶνος πρὸς Τηλεβόας μάχην, καὶ τὴν ἔριν Κιθαίρωνός τε καὶ Ἐλικῶνος, ἀφ' ὧν δὴ καὶ τὰ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ ὄρη προσαγορεύεται... τὸν δὲ Δημοδόκον εἰς Μυκίνας λαβὼν Ἀγαμέμνων ἔταξε τὴν Κλυταιμνήστραν τηρεῖν<sup>n</sup>.

If then it may be assumed, on the strength of this fable of Homer's, that the first year of the Trojan expedition must have been observed at the time, and remembered ever after, to have coincided with the first year of a certain contemporary cycle of eight years, and the last year with the second of the next to it; then it may be inferred with a moral, if not an absolute, certainty that this contemporary cycle must have been the current one of the Pythian ennead of Philam-

<sup>i</sup> Odyss. Θ. 72 sqq.

<sup>k</sup> Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. iv. 13,

2: Pliny, H. N. xvi. 88.

<sup>l</sup> Cf. Pausanias, viii. xxiii. 3, 4.

<sup>m</sup> Γ. 267. Πὰρ γὰρ ἔην καὶ αἰοιδός.

<sup>n</sup> Cf. Eustathius, ad Od. Γ. 267: 1466. 56.

mon—the most sacred *per se*, and the most nationally interesting, as well as the oldest, of any which ever existed among the Greeks in general. And it will follow from this conclusion that, if the year of the capture of Troy is known, the second year of one of the cycles of the Pythian ennead will be known also; and if the second, the first.

Now as to the date of the capture of Troy, we consider it of sufficient importance to deserve a Dissertation by itself; and we shall not enter upon it, merely *ἐκ παρήργου*, at present. We will observe only, in reference to the question itself, i. That four criterions of the actual day of the capture have been handed down from antiquity; *one*, the cosmical setting of the Pleiads, *another*, the October equus of the Roman calendar, the *third*, the first dichotomy, or *Luna octava* of the current lunar month, and the *fourth*, the date of the event in the solar calendar of the time being, the primitive equable calendar—the 12th of the fifth primitive solar month, the primitive Greek Thargelion. ii. That supposing the *year* of the capture, as determined by Eratosthenes. B.C. 1183, to have been the nearest to the truth of any which appear to have been assigned it by the chronologers of antiquity in general, and therefore the true year itself to have been either the same with this, or only a little earlier, or a little later, than this—all these tests and criterions of the true *day* of the capture, and consequently of the true *year* also, may be shewn to have met in October 19, reckoned from midnight, B. C. 1181, only two years later than the year of the capture, according to Eratosthenes. And if it was almost impossible, in the nature of things, that *four* such characters as these, each of them distinct from and independent of the rest, could have met together on any but the real day of the event; it will follow from these coincidences that B. C. 1181 must have been the actual year, and October 19 the actual day in that year, of the capture of Troy: and consequently, if B. C. 1181, as the true year of the capture, was the second year of the current cycle of the Pythian ennead, B. C. 1182 must have been the first. And the first year of one of these cycles, B.C. 1182, being given, nothing is easier than to go back from that to the first year of the last before it, B. C. 1190, and to the first of the last before

that, B. C. 1198, and so on, to B. C. 1222, or 1230 itself, or any other point of time which we have already determined as likely to have coincided with the acme of Philammon of Delphi—with that period of his personal existence at least to which the principal event of his history, his Pythian institution, was most probably to be assigned.

SECTION IV.—*On the Epoch, in terms both of the Year and of the Day.*

On this principle it might be considered that we had discovered the epoch of the cycle of Philammon, in terms of the year at least; but not that we had yet determined it in terms of the month, or in terms of the day of the month—a much more distinct and definite criterion of the truth, than the year alone. In the hope therefore of supplying this desideratum, let us be permitted to revert to the third of the characters of the true day of the capture of Troy, to which we have lately adverted; that of the first dichotomy, the Luna octava of the proper month. This character is too precise not to have been taken from some cyclical lunar reckoning of the time being. It runs in the style of a calendar date of its kind; and there is every ground from analogy and parity of reason to conclude that, handed down as this lunar date of the event has been along with the solar from the first, if the latter was taken from the solar calendar of the time being, the former must have been taken from some lunar one of the time being also. Now we know of no calendar reckoning from which such a lunar date as this, of the same antiquity as the event itself, might have been taken, and handed down to posterity, but the primitive Apis cycle, and the Octaëteric cycle of the Pythian ennead; and if the former is excluded by the circumstances of the case\*, the latter only could have supplied the date in question.

\* With respect to the primitive Apis cycle; though it cannot be denied, after what has been shewn of the Parthenian ennead of the Bœotians, that it must have been known to the Greeks, B. C. 1117, and therefore can scarcely be supposed to have been unknown only 64 years before, at the time of the capture of Troy; yet that the lunar date of the capture, the

It will follow on this principle that October 19, reckoned from midnight, B. C. 1181, was the Luna octava of the current month in the second year of one of the cycles of the Pythian Ennead; and therefore October 12 the Luna prima. And having this datum given, if we reckon back 59 days, or one lunar *δίμηρον*, from October 12 at midnight, the Luna prima of the second year in question for the month of October, B. C. 1181, we shall get to August 14 as the Luna prima of the month of August, in the same year of the same cycle. And this being assumed as the date of the Luna prima of the month of August in the second year of the current Pythian cycle, if we go forward *twelve* days from August 14, B. C. 1181, we shall arrive at the Luna prima of the month

Luna octava of the current month, could not have been taken from the primitive lunar cycle of the time being, may be shewn as follows.

The xxvith Type of this cycle (cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 383) entered our Tables *Æra Cyc.* 2751, at which time the lunar epoch had advanced to the Luna 30<sup>a</sup>, the solar continuing the same as at first, Thoth 8. B. C. 1181 in the Vulgar *Æra* corresponded to *Æra Cyc.* 2826; and the number of equable years between *Æra Cyc.* 2751, and *Æra Cyc.* 2826 being 75 exactly, the year of the capture of Troy, in the equable *Æra*, 2826 corresponded to Period xxvi, Cycle iv. 1, of the primitive lunar calendar.

*Primitive Apis Cycle.*

Type xxvi, Cycle iv. 1, Epoch Thoth 8 at midnight, *Æra Cyc.* 2826,  
June 17 at midnight, B. C. 1181.

The Luna 30<sup>a</sup>.

Mon.	Days.				
i	30	Thoth	8	June	17
ii	29	Phaophi	8	July	17
iii	30	Athyr	7	Aug.	15
iv	29	Chœac	7	Sept.	14
v	30	Tybi	6	Oct.	13
		Tybi	7	Oct.	14 the Luna 1 <sup>a</sup>
		—	12	—	19 — 6 <sup>a</sup> .

So that, if taken from this calendar, the date of the capture must have gone down to posterity as the Luna *sexta*, not as the Luna *octava*. And even if the lunar character of this xxvith Type had been the Luna 1<sup>a</sup>, not the 30th, (as it might have been,) still even in that case too, October 19 could have been only the Luna *septima*, not the *octava*.

of August in the first year of the same cycle, August 26, B. C. 1182—because, as B. C. 1181 was leap-year in the Julian cycle of that kind, the lunar epact in the Pythian cycle, B. C. 1181, was 12 days.

By this mode of reasoning, we should get to the Luna prima of August in the first year of one of the cycles of Philammon, August 26, B. C. 1182, with as much certainty as to the Luna prima of October in the second year of the same, October 12, B. C. 1181; and to each from the ascertained date of the Luna octava of the same month, and in the same year of the cycle, as the date of the capture of Troy, Oct. 19, B. C. 1181. And if August 26, the Julian date of the Luna prima of the corresponding Pythian month, B. C. 1182, was the Julian date of the first month in the first year of the current Pythian cycle—in arriving at that date, it is manifest that we should have arrived at the epoch of the Pythian cycle itself, in terms of the day at least, the Julian Aug. 26—though not yet in terms of the year. The cycle of Philammon, whensoever it took its rise, must have done so on the Julian August 26.

Let us therefore be permitted to assume this for the present; and further proof of its truth will be produced, we trust, in due time, which will serve to place it out of question. The true Julian date then even of the very first year of the Pythian Ennead, in terms of the day, having been thus determined to August 26, and the first year of one of its cycles having been ascertained also, B. C. 1182, laying both these discoveries together, we might venture to say we knew the true Julian date of that one Pythian cycle, which was current at the time of the capture of Troy, August 26, B. C. 1182. But we do not yet know the order and place of that one cycle in the decursus of such cycles from the epoch of the Pythian institution downwards, nor could we yet undertake to say we knew the date of the Pythian institution absolutely; only that, whatsoever it was, it must have been August 26, in some year which stood at the distance of a certain number of cycles of eight years complete from B. C. 1182. To supply this desideratum also we must again have recourse to the lunar character of the Julian date of the capture of Troy, October 19, B. C. 1181.

For if October 19 was the true Julian date of the Luna octava of that month, B. C. 1181, October 12 must have been the true Julian date of the Luna prima; and that it was so, will be demonstrated we trust hereafter by actual calculation. It follows that, if this date of the Luna octava, October 19, was taken from the Pythian cycle of the time being, that cycle, at that time, must have been true to the moon, and the calendar Luna prima according to this cycle for the time being must have been the true. And yet we have seen good reason to conclude that the proper lunar epoch of the Pythian Ennead must have been, in some sense or other, the Luna septima, and the proper character of the numenia of every month in every year of its proper cycle, according to its own assumptions at least, must have been the Luna septima. How then shall we reconcile this fact with the conclusion which has been collected from testimony, and is placed out of doubt by calculation, that the Numenia or Calendar Luna prima of one of the months, in one of the years of one of these cycles, October 12, B. C. 1181, was the true Luna prima?

It can be reconciled only by taking into account the inherent tendency of true lunar time to advance in the Octaëteric cycle on calendar or cyclical, at a stated rate, not less than a day and an half in every cycle, or three days in every two cycles. This precession consequently, in five cycles or forty years, could not be estimated at less than *seven* days complete; and its particular effect in a given instance would be, that if the lunar character of the cycle, in the first year of its decursus, was truly as well as nominally the Luna octava, at the end of five cycles, or forty years, though it might still be nominally the Luna octava, it would be truly the Luna prima.

On this principle, having ascertained the epoch of the cycle, which was current at the capture of Troy, August 26, B. C. 1182, and the true lunar character of *that* day in *that* year, the Luna prima—we draw *this* inference from *that* fact, That the cycle which began to be current August 26, B. C. 1182, and was still current at the capture of Troy, Oct. 19, 1181, was the *sixth* in the regular series of such cycles from the epoch of their institution: That the Pythian institution



was forty years old exactly, August 26, B. C. 1182; and that if we went back neither more nor less than five cycles of eight years from August 26, B. C. 1182, we should arrive at the date of the first cycle of all, the cycle contemporary with the institution, August 26, B. C. 1222.

SECTION V.—*On the confirmation of the Epoch of the Pythian Institution, August 26, in general, by the testimony of the Poet Alkæus.*

We hope, as we have already observed, to offer further proofs of the conclusion at which we have just arrived. At present, we propose to direct the attention of the reader only to one corroborative testimony of this kind, calculated to confirm our conclusion in general, by ascertaining the relation of the Pythian season to the natural year at least, if nothing more, in conformity to our date of the institution.

The sophist Himerius has preserved the ideas and substance, though not the words and metre, of a Pæan or Hymn of Alkæus, the subject of which must have been the *Γένεσις* of Apollo itself, and the first institution of the Pythian oracle and the Pythian chorus; and from this a clear idea may be formed of the season of the year to which the Pythian solemnity must have been attached in the time of Alkæus: and if in his time, no doubt from the first; the Pythian institution in the time of Alkæus, who was older than Hesiod, and contemporary with Sappho, and in point of antiquity stood next to Archilochus, being still, so far as any thing is known to the contrary, unchanged and unmodified, and still celebrated according to its original rule.

Ἐθέλω δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ Ἀλκαίου τιὰ λόγον εἰπεῖν, ὃν ἐκεῖνος ἦσει ἐν μέλεσι, παιᾶνα γράφων Ἀπόλλωνι. ἔρω δὲ ὑμῖν οὐ κατὰ τὰ μέλη τὰ Λέσβια, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ποτηγῆς τις ἐγὼ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέτρον αὐτὸ λύσας εἰς λόγον τῆς λύρας.

Ὅτε Ἀπόλλων ἐγένετο, κοσμήσας αὐτὸν ὁ Ζεὺς μίτρα τε χρυσῆ καὶ λύρα, δούς τε ἐπὶ τούτοις ἄρμα ἐλαύνειν· κύκροι δὲ ἦσαν τὸ ἄρμα εἰς Δελφοὺς πέμπει καὶ Κασταλίας νάματα, ἐκεῖθεν προφητεύοντα δίκην καὶ θέμιν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. ὁ δὲ ἐπιβὰς ἐπὶ τῶν ἁρμάτων ἔφη καὶ τοὺς κύκρους ἐς Ὑπερβορέους πέτεσθαι. Δελφοὶ μὲν οὖν ὡς ἦσθοντο, παιᾶνα συνθέτετε καὶ μέλος καὶ χοροὺς ἠϊθέων περὶ τὸν τρίποδα στήσαντες, ἐκάλουν τὸν θεὸν ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων

ἐλθεῖν. ὁ δὲ ἔτος ὅλον παρὰ τοῖς ἐκεῖ θεσμιστεύσας ἀνθρώποις, ἐπειδὴ καιρὸν ἐνομοθέτει καὶ τοὺς Δελφικοὺς ἠχῆσαι τρίποδας, αὐθις κελεύει τοῖς κύκνοις ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων ἐφίπτασθαι.

Ἦν μὲν οὖν θέρος καὶ τοῦ θέρους τὸ μέσον αὐτὸ ὅτε ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων Ἀλκαῖος ἄγει τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ὅτε δὴ, θέρους ἐκλάμποντος καὶ ἐπιδημοῦντος Ἀπόλλωνος, θερινόν τι καὶ ἡ λύρα περὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀβρύνεται. ἄδουσι μὲν ἀηδόνες αὐτῷ ὅποιον εἰκὸς ᾄσαι παρ' Ἀλκαίῳ τοὺς ὄρνιθας· ἄδουσι δὲ καὶ χελιδόνες καὶ τέττιγες, οὐ τὴν ἑαυτῶν τύχην τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγγέλλουσαι, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μέλη κατὰ θεοῦ φθεγγόμεναι. ρεῖ καὶ ἀργυροῖς ἡ Κασταλία κατὰ ποιήσιν νάμασι, καὶ Κηφισὸς μέγα αἶρεται πορφύρων τοῖς κύμασι. τὸν Ἐνιπέα τοῦ Ὀμήρου μιμούμενος· βιάζεται μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκαῖος ὁμοίως Ὀμήρῳ ποιῆσαι καὶ ὕδωρ θεῶν ἐπιδημίαν αἰσθέσθαι δυνάμενον<sup>ο</sup>.

It is clear from this account that the Pythian season, in the time of Alkæus, was the summer, and the middle of summer: Ἦν μὲν οὖν θέρος καὶ τοῦ θέρους τὸ μέσον ὅτε ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων Ἀλκαῖος ἄγει τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα—and this return, according to the same account, being just a year after the birth of Apollo, and a year spent among the Hyperboreans, it follows that Apollo himself must have been born at the same season also; i. e. the Pythian institution, and the birth of the Pythian Apollo, both fell out in the summer, and in the middle of the summer.

Now though the summer division of the natural year, in the Parapegmata of the ancient Greeks, began much earlier in the natural year than it does in the modern division of the seasons, yet this note of time, the middle of summer, even in the idiom of the ancient Greeks, never denoted a period in the natural year earlier than midsummer. And that a period later than midsummer at least must have been meant by this description of the time of the first coming of Apollo to Delphi, is so significantly intimated by no circumstance of the description as by the allusion to the τέττιγες, which are supposed to have welcomed his arrival, along with the rest of nature, both animate and inanimate. For this is a clear intimation that this first coming of Apollo, and consequently this first institution of the Pythian chorus, fell within that period of the natural year, in which the τέττιξ was known to sing. And that period, as we hope to shew

more at large hereafter, was only an interval of two months beginning with midsummer, and consequently in the middle of the summer, strictly so called; the Julian dates of which for the time of Alkæus must have been July and August. The Pythian month consequently in the time of Alkæus, (and if in the time of Alkæus, from the first.) must have been one of these two, July or August; and the earliest date of the Pythian ennead, according to our own scheme, for the time of Alkæus, as we shall see hereafter, being August 6, and the latest Sept. 1. it is manifest that the stated Pythian month in his time must always have been one of those in which the *τέρτιξ* was known to sing.

SECTION VI.—*On the relation of the Pythian Cycle of Philammon to the Cretan Cycle of Minos.*

If the date of the octaëteric cycle of Minos was September 23, B. C. 1260, and that of the cycle of Philammon August 26, B. C. 1222, the former was 38 years older than the latter. It follows that the Pythian octaëteris of Philammon could not have been the first conception of its kind which had been formed among the ancient Greeks; and yet it may be a proper subject of consideration whether even this later conception of the same thing in general, relatively to its proper author, might not have been as original as the earlier, or whether the first idea of the Pythian cycle must have been suggested by the Cretan cycle of Minos.

And in answer to these questions, it is important to remind the reader of the very early connection between the Pythian institution and Crete, which appears to have been traditionally handed down among the Greeks; the supposition of which it would be difficult to account for on any principle but that of the ultimate reference of this institution in some manner or other to the island of Crete. For example, tradition appears to have handed it down that the Apollo of the Pythian fable, after the death of the Pytho, retired first of all to Crete; that the purification required by the death of the Pytho was administered to him in Crete; that the person who performed this ceremony was *Καρμάνωρ* of Crete; that the victor in the first Pythian chorus (the chorus which inaugurated the Pythian solemnity itself) was *Χρυσόθεμις*, the

son of this *Καρμάνωρ* of Crete; the victor only in the next was the founder of the institution, Philammon. Such representations as these could not have made part of the original tradition on these points; according to which, as we hope to see by and by, the locality of the secession of Apollo after the death of Pytho, and the scene of the purification of which he stood in need, could have been nothing but the Thessalian Tempe; yet they might very possibly have made part of the popular version of the same tradition, as purposely modified in later times to accommodate it to another equally ancient and authentic tradition, that the Pythian institution of Philammon was ultimately derived from Crete.

For that there must have been very early, if not from the first, a supposed connection between the Apollo of Delphi and Crete, and that the first and oldest order of the priests and ministers of the Delphian oracle and the Delphian Apollo themselves must have been of Cretan extraction, as a simple matter of fact, may be collected from this later tradition itself. The fable, which embodied this tradition, is most circumstantially related in the hymn to Apollo, ascribed to Homer; viz. that Apollo had no sooner been born, and no sooner made choice of Delphi as the site of his future oracle and temple, than he constituted a body of Cretans, who were sailing at the time from Crete to Pylus, his servants and ministers there; having appeared to them for that purpose in the form of a dolphin, and under that form conducted their ship from the promontory of Malea to the gulf of Crissa. And it is very observable that these Cretans are supposed to have come from Cnosus, the city of Minos, in Crete; and though Cnosus was not a seaport, to have been sailing thence, on a trading expedition to this quarter, when they were thus pressed by Apollo into his own service at Delphi—

Καὶ τότε δὴ κατὰ θυμὸν ἐφράζετο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων  
 οὔστινας ἀνθρώπους ὀργίνας εἰσαγάγοιτο,  
 οἱ θεραπεύονται Πυθοῖ ἐνὶ πετρηέσση.  
 ταῦτ' ἄρα ὀρμαίνων ἐνόησ' ἐπὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ  
 νῆα θοήν, ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ἔσαν πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοί,  
 Κρήτες ἀπὸ Κνωσοῦ Μινωῖου ἢ, οἳ ῥά τ' ἀνακτι  
 ἱερά τε ῥέζουσι καὶ ἀγγέλλουσι θέμιστας

Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσαόρου, ὅττι κεν εἴπη,  
 χρείων ἐκ δάφνης γυάλων ὕπο Παρνησοῖο.  
 οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ πρῆξι καὶ χρήματα νῆϊ μελαίνῃ  
 ἐς Πύλον ἤμαθόντα Πυληγενέας τ' ἀνθρώπους  
 ἔπλεον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσι συνήντετο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,  
 ἐν πόντῳ δ' ἐπόρουσε δέμας δελφίνι εἰοικῶς  
 νῆϊ θοῇ, καὶ κείτο πέλωρ μέγα τε δεινόν τε  
 κ', τ. λ.<sup>9</sup>

This fable is recognised by Plutarch<sup>r</sup>, and is attested by the surname of Δελφίνιος, the Dolphin-God, founded upon it, applied to Apollo himself<sup>s</sup>—and by the etymon of the name of Δελφοί, which is explained by it<sup>t</sup>—and according to the author of the Hymns<sup>v</sup>, by the title of the first altar, erected to Apollo at Delphi, the Βωμὸς Δέλφειος. According to some of the ancients too, the spring of Castalia, in the neighbourhood of the oracle, took its name from that of the leader of these Cretans, Καστάλιος the Cretan<sup>x</sup>: and we learn from Pindar<sup>y</sup>, that the oldest statue of Apollo himself at Delphi, made out of the wood of a single tree, after the model of the Δαίδαλα ascribed to Dædalus<sup>z</sup>, was set up and dedicated there by Cretans.

That there must consequently have been a very early connection between the worship of Apollo and the oracle of Delphi, and Crete in particular, there is every reason to believe: and it is worth while to observe that this fact must have been so notorious in the time of the author of the Hymn to Apollo, that, according to his representation<sup>a</sup>, these Cretans might have been the proper servants and ministers of the Pythian Apollo even before they came to Delphi from Crete: though the true explanation of this mode of speaking of them in this first instance is, no doubt, because they were the ancestors of those who, even at Delphi, had long been standing in that relation to the Pythian Apollo, before this Hymn was written; and the author treats them as the types and representatives of their order from the first.

<sup>9</sup> Hymnus ad Apollin. 388 sqq.

<sup>r</sup> De Solertia Animalium, xxxvi.

<sup>s</sup> Hymn. ad Apollin. 495: Plutarch, Theseus, xviii: Lycophron, 208. and Schol.: Pindar, Nemea, v. 82. and the Scholia: Etym. M. Δελφίνιος.

<sup>t</sup> Steph. Byz. Δελφοί: Servius, ad

Æneid. iii. 332.

<sup>v</sup> Vers. 495, 496.

<sup>x</sup> Etym. M. Δελφίνιος: cf. Pausanias, x. vi. 2: viii. 5.

<sup>y</sup> Pythia, v. 52.

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Vol. iv. page 653 sqq.

<sup>a</sup> Vers. 393-395.

Now all this admits of a natural explanation, if we may only assume that the Cretan fable of Minos, with its most characteristic circumstances, was not unknown to the author of the Pythian one: and the power and fame of Minos—his invasion and subjugation of Attica—the Athenian *Δασμὸς*—the personal history of Theseus—and the reception even in the Peloponnese, before the time of Philammon, of some of the divinities first brought into notice in Crete—render it morally certain that the Cretan Theogony, the Cretan Fable, and the Cretan Octaëteris of Minos, could not have been unknown to any inquisitive and intelligent Greek of the time of Philammon. The Zeus of Minos, as an impersonation of the sun, was competent therefore to have suggested to the author of the Pythian fable the idea of his Apollo, in the same capacity. The cave and the oracle at Dicte in Crete, connected from the first with the Zeus of Crete, might have suggested in like manner the use of the cavern and the oracle at Delphi in connection with the Apollo of Philammon: and the lunar and solar cycle which came into existence in Crete along with the Zeus of Minos, and was expressly intended to regulate the worship of Zeus in Crete, was still more competent *a priori* to suggest to Philammon the idea of his own cycle of the same kind, (and even his Pytho, as the impersonation thereof,) for the service of the Pythian institution and the Pythian Apollo.

And when we consider that if there was any preexisting settlement in this quarter, it must have been only that of Lycorceia, on the top of the Parnassian ridge—and that the Delphian Basin, in which the oracle was situated, must still have been totally uninhabited, it will appear to be only a reasonable inference that the true founder of the city of Delphi—the city which grew up by degrees round the oracle and temple of the Pythian Apollo—must have been Philammon; and its inhabitants, in the first instance, none but the priests and ministers of Apollo, and his oracle. And on this point the tradition to which we have just adverted, that the ministers of the Pythian Apollo at Delphi, from the first and down to the latest times, were Cretans, comes in to confirm our conclusion in a very striking manner. The ancestors of this hereditary family of priests and ministers at Delphi must

have been purposely brought from Crete. Nor could any thing be more probable *a priori* than that, if Philammon was proposing to open an oracle at Delphi, in honour of the sun, analogous to that at Dictæ in Crete, dedicated there also to the sun, he should have wished to put it, if possible, from the first, under the care and superintendance of Cretans, and of Cretans from Cnosus in Crete.

We may therefore conclude that the first idea of his Pythian institution was probably suggested to Philammon by the Cretan mysteries of Minos; the idea of his oracle at Delphi, by the oracle at Dictæ in Crete; the idea of his Apollo by the Zeus of Minos; and the idea of his cycle by the cycle of Minos: and we may accept the testimony of antiquity to the fact that the hereditary priests and ministers of the Pythian Apollo were of Cretan origin; but with this explanation—that they were probably a certain number of families from Cnosus in Crete, which Philammon himself had persuaded to settle at Delphi, and to cooperate with him in the scheme which he had planned for opening an oracle there in the name of his Apollo, like that which their own Minos had already opened in Crete in the name of his Zeus. But with respect to his cycle in particular, we cannot assume that more than simply its first idea and conception could have been derived from the cycle of Minos. The cycle of Philammon was not commensurable with that of Minos; and the details of the two, through every year of their respective decursus, differed too widely for either to have been borrowed from the other.

SECTION VII.—*On the Lunar Character of the Cycle of Philammon; and on the relation of August 26, B. C. 1222 to the Primitive Solar and the Primitive Lunar Calendar.*

The epoch of a solar and lunar cycle is necessarily common to both the sun and the moon; but as the head of the decursus of the solar momenta, it is necessarily a solar term, and as that of the lunar also, it is necessarily a lunar one. And as to the proportion of these terms *inter se*, the most natural presumption *a priori* is that it would, or should be, one of equality; that the solar term, as the epoch of the cycle, would or should be the same in relation to the proper solar

reckoning of the cycle, as the lunar in the same capacity to the proper lunar reckoning also—not indeed of necessity, and under all circumstances, the first day of the solar and the first day of the lunar month; but notwithstanding, the same day in the solar month as in the lunar, and the same in the lunar as in the solar. Such, we say, is the first, the most obvious, and the most natural expectation, which could be conceived *a priori* of the relation of the solar and lunar momenta, as combined, or about to be combined, in a common solar and lunar cycle, and as starting, or ready to start, from a common solar and lunar epoch. Let us therefore proceed to apply this very natural and obvious presumption to the Julian epoch of the cycle of Philammon, as already determined, August 26, B. C. 1222; and first of all in the Proleptic Julian year.

The state of the question in this respect will be, whether this Julian term, August 26, the 26th of the solar August, B. C. 1222, was the 26th of the lunar August the same year also; and that question is easily decided. In the General Lunar Calendar of our *Fasti Catholici*, B. C. 1222 corresponded to Period. x. Cycle iii. 9: and the first of our Nisan in that year coinciding with April 22 at midnight, the first of our Ab coincided with August 18 at midnight\*; and consequently August 26, reckoned from midnight, was the Luna nona, reckoned from midnight also. It is manifest therefore that an octaëteric cycle, supposed to have come into being on August 26 at midnight, B. C. 1222, would have done so on the 26th of the solar in the sense of the Julian month for the time being, and on the ninth of the lunar, in the same sense, for the time being also; between which, as mutually adapted to become the head of a cycle common to both, there could be no analogy, founded at least in the reason of

\* The true new moon of August, B. C. 1222, as determined by calculation, only confirms our Calendar. We have by calculation for the meridians of Greenwich and Delphi respectively—

B. C. 1222.		h.	m.	s.	
The mean new moon, August 18	13	3	12		m. t. Greenwich.
	—	14	38	35	m. t. Delphi.
The true new moon, August 18	1	5	10		m. t. Greenwich.
	—	2	40	33	m. t. Delphi.



things, nor any connection *de facto*, except an arbitrary and positive one.

Let us, in the next place, apply the same presumption to this same Julian term, August 26, B. C. 1222, considered as the Julian representative of some corresponding term, first in the Primitive solar, and secondly, in the Primitive lunar, year.

In the first place, this year, B. C. 1222 in the *Æra Vulgaris*, corresponded to *Æra Cyclica* 2785. And in that year of the Cyclical *æra* the first of the Primitive *Thoth*, reckoned from midnight, was falling on June 21 at midnight.

*Æra Cyclica* 2785, B. C. 1222.

Thoth 1 at midnight.	June 21 at midnight.
Phaophi 1 ———	July 21 ———
Athyr 1 ———	August 20 ———
Athyr 7 at midnight.	August 26 at midnight.

So that the Julian date of the Pythian epoch, August 26 at midnight, B. C. 1222, in the equable style of the time being was Athyr 7 at midnight, *Æra cyc.* 2785.

In the next place, the xxvith Type of the Primitive *Apis* cycle (the natural lunar cycle of the primitive solar year) having entered our Tables on *Thoth* 8 at midnight, *Æra cyc.* 2751<sup>b</sup>, the 30th *Luna* for the time being; *Æra cyc.* 2785, 34 years later in that *æra*, corresponded to the *ninth* solar, the *tenth* lunar, year of the *second* cycle of this Type: in which year the stated epoch being the solar *Paüni* 7, *Paüni* 7 was the *Luna* 30, and therefore *Paüni* 8 the *Luna prima*.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 383.

*Primitive Apis Cycle.*

Type xxvi, Cycle ii. 10 = 9.

Æra Cyclica 2784-2785.

Thoth	1	midn.	Æra cyc. 2784	June 21	midn.	B. C. 1223.
Phaophi	1			July 21		
Athyr	1			Aug. 20		
Chœac	1			Sept. 19		
Tybi	1			Oct. 19		
Mecheir	1			Nov. 18		
Phamenoth	1			Dec. 18		
Pharmuthi	1			Jan. 17	midn.	B. C. 1222.
Pachon	1			Feb. 16		
Paüni	1			March 18		

Paüni 8, March 25, the Luna Prima.

	Days.				
Paüni	8	30	Æra cyc. 2784	March 25	B. C. 1222.
Epiphi	8	29		April 24	
Mesore	7	30		May 23	
Thoth	2	29	Æra cyc. 2785	June 22	
Phaophi	1	30		July 21	
Athyr	1	29		August 20	

Athyr 7, August 26.

So that in this form of the lunar cycle, and at this particular time, the *seventh* of the solar Athyr was the *seventh* of the lunar also, and both were the same with the Julian Aug. 26, B. C. 1222. This Julian term therefore, at this particular time, was competent to answer alike to the seventh of the solar and to the seventh of the lunar month; and therefore to serve as the most natural epoch imaginable for the decursus of a lunar and solar cycle, like this of Philammon's, now coming into being. And we may justly consider this coincidence a striking confirmation of that Julian term itself, as the true Julian date of the epoch\*.

\* It may be objected that August 26, B. C. 1222, was not the Luna septima, but rather the Luna nona; and yet that will be no difficulty. It was peculiar to primitive lunar time to bear date on the Luna *quarta*, reckoned from the change, the Luna *tertia*, reckoned from the phasis: cf. our *Fasti Catholici*, iv. 368 sqq., also our *Prolegomena* to the *Origines Kalen-*

It follows that both the Apollo and the Artamis of Philammon, according to his own view of the Γένεσις of each, must have been born on the same day, and *that* the seventh of the *solar*, and the seventh of the *lunar*, month alike. And as he must have represented both as the children of one mother, his Lato, yet as twins, conceived and brought forth, under the same circumstances of relation to everything else, we cannot imagine how he could have supposed them born, except on the same day, whatsoever the proper style of that day; which, *a priori*, might seem to have been indifferent, provided it was only the same both in the solar and in the lunar calendar of the time being. And since it appears to have been determined *de facto* to the seventh of the month in each case, and that month the primitive Athyr; this

darīæ Italicæ (p. xcvi.): and the oldest name for the lunar month in Greek, μείς, and its proper signification also, is one among other arguments that this primitive rule of the reckoning of lunar time must have been as true originally of the Greeks as of any other nation of antiquity. On this principle, it is easy to see that the same lunar term in a given instance might be both the Luna prima and the Luna tertia, and the Luna septima and the Luna nona.

And should it be further objected that the natural lunar calendar of the primitive solar year, on this supposition, must have been known to Philammon of Delphi, there will be still less difficulty in that objection. This Primitive lunar cycle was still in use in Egypt in the time of Philammon, exactly as it had been from the beginning of things; and whether known or unknown to the Greeks, his contemporaries, in general, it might have become known to him in particular, either from a personal visit to Egypt, or from personal intercourse with those who had been there, in his time. Egypt was the quarter to which all who were in search of light and information of any kind were accustomed to resort. And only eight years before the time of Philammon himself, (only one cycle of his own Octaëteris previously,) Melampus, as we have seen, had brought from Egypt the idea of the Egyptian Osiris, under the name of the Indian Deunus, or the Greek Δεύνυσος. Is it less probable that the natural lunar cycle of the primitive solar year should have been known to Philammon, B. C. 1222, than to Ptolemaus, the author of the Parthenian Ennead, 105 years later? or to Solon and his contemporaries, B. C. 592, 630 years afterwards? or to the successors of Solon in the work of the different lunar corrections of the primitive solar year, extending in all over a period of 125 years, from B. C. 592 to B. C. 468—yet each succeeding one exactly 25 years, or one period of the Primitive lunar cycle, in the equable æra, distant from the preceding?

argues a preference for the primitive Athyr above any other month of the primitive year—a preference, which, as we have often had occasion to explain, is ultimately to be traced to the fact that, from the time of the introduction of the worship of Osiris and Isis among the ancient Egyptians, B. C. 1350, this month Athyr in particular had come to be generally regarded as specially set apart for the Γένεσις of similar conceptions and impersonations, and the institution of similar services in honour of them, elsewhere. It is not surprising therefore that the cardinal dates of the system of Philammon also, the birthday of his Apollo, the type of the sun, and the birthday of his Artemis, that of the moon, both meeting in the first instance in the epoch of his cycle, should have been taken from this month. And should it be objected that if the example of the Egyptians, B. C. 1350, had consecrated one month, the primitive Athyr, for such purposes as these, it had consecrated one day of that month, the 17th of Athyr, for the same purposes also, the true answer to this objection may possibly be, that there were special reasons in this instance for fixing on the 7th of Athyr instead of the 17th; though, as those reasons involve a very nice and curious point of a different kind, we cannot enter on their explanation at present, but must reserve it for a future opportunity.

SECTION VIII.—*On the dates of the births of Apollo and Artemis in later times, and on the fable of their birth at Delos.*

It has been seen<sup>c</sup> that even the tradition of later times, respecting the birth of Apollo, confirms the conclusion to which we came concerning the Pythian epoch, and the connection of the fable of the birth of the Pythian Apollo with it, from the first. But it may be objected that the traditional date of the birth of Artemis in later times is just as much opposed to this conclusion, as that of the birth of Apollo is in unison with it; for it is well known that the received birthday of the Hellenic Artemis, according to the later tradition, was the sixth of the month, though that of the Hellenic Apollo was the seventh; and that the sixth of the

<sup>c</sup> Supra, 678. cf. Vol. i. 190.

month, in the popular opinion, was as much sacred to the former, as the seventh of the month to the latter.

It is manifest however that even the later belief on both these points is ultimately to be traced to the Pythian fable of Philammon; that it agreed with this fable respecting the birth of Apollo, and differed from it only *per accidens* with respect to that of Artemis—i. e. in dating this, though not on the same day as that of Apollo, yet only one day earlier: for that was a kind and degree of distinction between them which was very likely to be made in the course of time, without any prejudice to the fact of a different and an earlier tradition on the same point.

The Apollo of Philammon being the type of solar time as entering his cycle perpetually, and his Artamis the type of lunar in the same relation to it, it was absolutely essential to the first principles of *his* system that both should have come into being on the *same* day, and *that* day the epoch of his cycle; and if this day, as the birthday of his Apollo, must have been the seventh of the solar month, as that of his Artemis it must have been the seventh of the Lunar: so that both might be said to have been born on the seventh day, but in a different kind of reckoning, respectively. This distinction was founded in the nature of things; and in Philammon's time, when both the primitive solar, and the primitive lunar, year might have been alike still in use, it would be agreeable to the matter of fact. But if it was to be kept in view ever after, the difference between the civil calendar of former times and that of later would require to be remembered also; that there was a solar calendar in the time of Philammon, from which he took the date of the birth of his Apollo, and a lunar one, from which he took that of his Artamis. It is certain however that this difference was not kept in mind by the Greeks of later times; that all which was remembered and handed down on this point was that their Apollo was born on the seventh of the month, but whether on the seventh of the solar, or on the seventh of the lunar, either was never handed down at all, or what is more probable, though handed down rightly at first, was ultimately forgotten.

The Apollo and the Artamis of Philammon therefore having

ceased to be regarded in the apprehension of later times as the respective impersonations of the solar and the lunar element, which must have entered into the composition of such a cycle as the Pythian Ennead, it is not surprising that the birthday of Apollo, in the course of time, should have come to be confounded with the seventh of the lunar instead of the solar month, and the birthday of Artemis, as something distinct from his, to be shifted from the seventh day of the month to the sixth. For even in the popular apprehension of these two ideas, at all times, the Apollo and the Artemis of the Greeks were regarded as names of kindred nature, and relative or proportionate identity; such that the objects denoted by them must have preceded or followed each other in the order of their being itself. Thus, according to Servius<sup>d</sup>, if one was the type of nocturnal time, the other was that of diurnal; and the night, in the nature of things, preceding the day, Artemis, the type of the former, must have been born before Apollo, that of the latter—*Quod autem diximus Dianam primo natam rationis est: nam constat primo noctem fuisse, cujus instrumentum est luna, id est Diana; post diem, quem sol efficit, qui est Apollo.* And it is easy to see that, regarded even as the sun and the moon respectively, one of them, Artemis, as the type of the subordinate and inferior luminary, might be supposed for various reasons to have *come* into being before the other, Apollo, the type of the principal and superior one.

We should be entirely of opinion however that the true reason after all why the birthday of the Artemis of classical mythology was fixed to the sixth of the month, was simply because that of the Apollo was fixed to the seventh—and one of the offices and functions which the popular belief of the later Greeks assigned to their own Artemis being that of the Lucina of the Romans, the universal *Maïa* or obstetrix, it was necessary she should be born herself the day before her brother, in order to assert and exemplify her right to this relation from the first, by assisting at and facilitating the birth of Apollo himself, as tradition represented her to have done<sup>e</sup>. In a word, this distinction in a circumstance of the

<sup>d</sup> Ad Æneid. iii. 73.

<sup>e</sup> Scholia in Hecubam, 454 : Servius ad Æneid. iii. 73.

original Pythian fable, the most liable *a priori* of all to misconstruction, that of the birth of the Apollo and the Artamis of that fable on the same day, but in a different reckoning, was no more than what in the course of time was to be expected; especially after the transition of the old solar calendar among the Greeks into the lunar, the consequence of which could scarcely fail to be that if the birthday of Apollo still continued nominally attached to the seventh of the month, that of Artemis would be shifted to the day *after* or the day *before* the seventh.

The classical Γένεσις indeed of Apollo and Artemis could not have been that of Philammon; yet even the former, as representing both of them in the relation of the children of Lato, or Latona, must have been founded originally upon the latter. Nor was there in fact any real difference between them, except that the Apollo and the Artemis of the classical fable, besides being the children of Latona, were the son and the daughter of Zeus also; and that was a change in the idea and mode of their origination which must be made some time or other, if these two children of the Lato of Philammon were to be admitted into the family of the Olympic gods. As to the circumstances and adjuncts of this fable—the jealousy of Hera, the persecution of Lato, or Latona, the whole of the œconomy which prepares the way for, and conducts to, the consummation in the shape of the birth at last—forasmuch as they all issue out in that one result of the parturition of Lato, and the birth of the twin divinities, in one locality, and that locality the island of Delos, we may very reasonably conclude that the fable was invented solely with a view to that result—solely in order that Apollo and Artemis should be born in Delos at last, and Delos on that account should become sacred to both, from the moment of their birth<sup>f</sup>; and very probably too, because, before the invention of this fable itself, Delos had long been the scene of a solemnity, under the name of the Delia, dedicated to the cosmogonic powers of nature in general, and possibly to the sun and the

<sup>f</sup> Scholia on Iliad. A. 9: Homeri Hymnus ad Apollinem, 14-119: Callimachus, Hymnus in Delum, v: Apollonius Rhod. i. 409-419: 537: and the Scholia: Argumentum Pythium Pri-

mum: Steph. Byz. Δῆλος: Etym. Mag. Δῆλος: Athenæus, ix. 47: xv. 50: Anthologia, i. 90. Scol. xi: Hyginus, Fabulæ, liii. Asterie: cxl. Pythia: Servius ad Æn. iii. 73.

moon in particular; of which we may have occasion to say more hereafter.

SECTION IX.—*On the interval between the Luna Prima in the Cycle of Philammon, and the Epoch of the Cycle; and on the œconomy to which it was subservient.*

It follows by way of corollary to the preceding conclusions, that as the solar character of the Pythian cycle was the seventh of the solar month, and the lunar was the seventh of the lunar, reckoned by the rule of the Primitive Apis cycle from the Luna tertia, not the Luna prima, there were eight lunar terms, equivalent to eight lunar days, between the true Luna prima of his cycle, and the epoch; the date of the true conjunction in August B. C. 1222 having been August 18, that of the epoch of the cycle of Philammon having been August 26, the ninth luna, reckoned from August 18. It is reasonable to suppose that these distinctions were understood at the time; and therefore that these assumptions must have been deliberately made, not in ignorance of the truth: and if so, it becomes an interesting question, whether any probable reason can be assigned for them? whether they can be shewn to have served any particular purpose?

And in our opinion the answer to this question is found in that part of the œconomy of the original fable which at first sight would seem to have been the least subservient to the final end of the whole, the recognition of the divinity of the Pythian Apollo, and the standing proof of it which was destined to be given by the opening of the oracle at Delphi.

It was necessary to this consummation, that the Pytho, the only preexisting obstacle to it, should be removed out of the way; and it was consistent with the course of things, as laid down and planned by the author of the fable himself, that the instrumental means of this removal should be the Apollo of the fable. But when that had been done, and full proof had thereby been made both of the good will of this Apollo towards mankind, and of his ability to carry it into effect; what was more naturally to have been expected than that the recognition of his divinity on the part of mankind should have followed without delay on the death of the Pytho? that he should have proceeded at once to take pos-



session of the prophetic tripod, and to inaugurate the Pythian solemnity, amidst the acclamations and praises of his worshippers. How contrary to this natural expectation that the death of such a monster as the Pytho should entail a pollution on the holiness of the youthful Apollo; without the removal of which even he could not yet be received as the impersonation of the Divine good will and power in behalf of his own creatures! and until the removal of which even he must submit to be banished for a time from the scene of his recent victory, and of his future glorification!

The explanation of this apparent inconsistency is probably supplied by the fact to which we have just adverted; that there was a certain number of days which might be considered to belong to the beginning of the Pythian cycle, and yet had been *de facto* cut off from it. These were the days which made up the interval between the true *Luna prima* of the cycle and the epoch, the *Luna septima*, reckoned from the *Luna tertia*. These days were open to any use which might be made of them, from the special reasons of the case; and it appears to us the most natural account of them, to suppose that they were purposely detached from the beginning of the cycle, for the sake of the œconomy, assumed in the fable, between the death of the Pytho, and the installation of the Apollo in the possession of the oracle at Delphi. These days must necessarily be omitted from the actual reckoning of the first cycle, if that was to set out from the *Luna septima*, reckoned as above; and yet, as virtually a part of the cycle, and actually connected with its solar and lunar reckoning, these eight days between August 18 and August 26, Philammon might think, could not be better devoted than to an intermediate œconomy, between the death of his Pytho and the installation of his Apollo: including his supposed banishment and purification in consequence of the former, and his triumphal return along a sacred road, preliminary to the latter.

It is plainly to be collected from the testimony of Plutarch<sup>i</sup>, that when that dialogue, *De Oraculorum Defectu*, was going on, the Πύθια there alluded to (the Πύθια ἐπὶ Κλεομβρότου) were at hand, but not yet begun—that the Θεωρία,

<sup>i</sup> *Supra*, 640.

usually despatched to Tempe on the occasion of every fresh Πυθιάς or Ennead, had been already sent, but had not yet returned. The inference from which state of the case is this, That even in Plutarch's time it must have been the rule to send this Θεωρία some time before the games began; and therefore in all probability was so from the first. And if it is only reasonable to suppose the games were ready to begin, and yet had not actually begun, while this Θεωρία was still absent, the inference from that fact too will be, that they were waiting for its return, in order to begin. So that the rule, both at this time and from the first, it may be presumed, must have been *this*; To send the Θεωρία on its proper errand a certain length of time before the beginning of the games, and to begin the games immediately on its return: and such a rule *de facto* from the earliest to the latest times would be altogether consistent with the conjecture which we have proposed, concerning the use and application of the eight days between the true Luna prima of the cycle of Philammon, and its actual epoch—the Luna nona, from the true Luna prima, the Luna septima, from its assumed Luna prima, the Luna tertia—the interval in the first instance between the Julian August 18 and the Julian August 26.

Now the scene of the banishment and of the purification of the Pythian Apollo, and the quarter from which he sets out on his triumphal return to Delphi, being the Thessalian Tempe; let us first consider the distance of the vale of Tempe from Delphi. According to D'Anville, the distance from Delphi to the mouth of the Peneus, in a straight line, was 71 Roman miles, = 80 by road; and it was not much more by the pass of Thermopylæ. On this principle, at the ordinary rate of a day's journey, 20 Roman miles, 16 English, four days would seem to have been sufficient, to travel on foot from Delphi to the mouth of the Peneus, and four to return; and therefore the eight days between August 18 and August 26, at the beginning of one of the Pythian cycles sufficient, both to go to Tempe, and to return to Delphi.

But we are here bound to take into account the further matter of fact, which we learn from the tradition of antiquity, that whatsoever course the Θεωρία might take in going to

the vale of Tempe from Delphi, its return from that quarter to Delphi at least was regulated by an usage and prescription, as old as the Pythian institution itself; by virtue of which it was obliged to follow the track marked out in the first instance by Apollo himself, when he also returned for the first time; and which on that account was called the *Ἱερὰ ὁδός*. And though none of our earlier authorities has left on record a description of this road, Ælian has given an account of it, quoted *supra*<sup>k</sup>, from which we may form a general idea of its course and direction.

This *Ἱερὰ ὁδός*, travelled over by Apollo himself in the first instance, and by the Delphian youth, who represented him, on every subsequent occasion, according to Ælian, lay through Pelagonia, Œta, the country of the Ænians, that of the Melians, that of the Dorians, and that of the Epizephyrian Locrians respectively: all of them west of the pass of Thermopylæ; and the last in particular, on the west of Delphi itself, though contiguous to it. And that is demonstrative that, although in going to Tempe the *Θεωρία* might take the shortest and most direct route, it could never have done so in returning. It is observable also that the first of the regions enumerated, as visited by it, Pelagonia, was part of the ancient Macedonia rather than of the ancient Thessaly<sup>l</sup>; lying to the north of Thessaly, and separated from it by the ancient Perrhæbia: so that, on this principle, if the *Θεωρία* actually visited this part in returning, it must have travelled for a time in the opposite direction to Delphi, which lay to the south of the vale of Tempe, as Pelagonia did to the north.

From the traditionary explanation too of the name of the *Δειπνιάς* (*κώμη*), a village near Larissa<sup>m</sup>, we learn that though the *Θεωρία* on the morning of the first day of the return might be at the mouth of the Peneus, or anywhere else in the vale of Tempe, yet by the evening of the same day it was bound to be at this *Δειπνιάς*; and the distance from the mouth of the Peneus to Larissa itself not having been more than 24 or 25 Roman miles, to the *Δειπνιάς* it might have been some miles less; so that the first day's journey along this *Ἱερὰ ὁδός* from the vale of Tempe to this quarter might not be more than 15 or 16 miles, and yet would be a fair specimen

<sup>k</sup> *Supra*, 641, 642.<sup>l</sup> Strabo, ix. 5. 302.<sup>m</sup> Stephanus Byz.

of the rest: and if, after leaving the *Δειπνιάς*, it actually passed through Perrhæbia to the confines of Pelagonia, 34 or 35 Roman miles to the north, two days at least would thus be occupied in travelling away from Delphi to the north, instead of towards it and to the south.

We are much inclined however to conjecture that in this circumstance of his description Ælian may have confounded Perrhæbia with Pelagonia; and that the course, which the *Θεωρία* actually took, was first from the vale of Tempe to the *Δειπνιάς*, due west of Tempe, and from thence northward, to the borders of Perrhæbia, and after that, along the line defined by Ælian as the sacred way, Mount Cæta, Ænianis, Melis, Doris, Locris, on the west; so as in fact to make the entire circuit of Thessaly, from the mouth of the Peneus, and along the Peneus, on the north, and under the ridges of Mount Pindus and Mount Cæta, on the west and south. The distance from Larissa to Delphi was 75 Roman miles direct, 84 or 85 by road; and from the vale of Tempe (somewhere 15 or 16 miles further east) the whole length of the *ἱερὰ ὁδὸς* could not have been less than one hundred miles by road: which at the rate of 15 miles a day would require seven days to travel.

We propose it therefore as a probable conjecture that the rule of the Pythian *Θεωρία*, from the first institution of the Pythian solemnity, was this; To send it on every such occasion from Delphi, so as to arrive at the vale of Tempe on the eve of the 18th of August, the true Luna Prima of the cycle of Philammon; on the 18th to go through the ceremony of the purification in the vale of Tempe, whatsoever that was; and that being over, and all the other preparations for the return (including the boughs of laurel for the construction of the new Pythian *Καλιὰς*, and for the crowns of the victors in the games, from the proper tree in the vale of Tempe) being now complete, the next day, August 19, to begin the return, and to sup at *Δειπνιάς* the same day, and to pass the night there; and the day after leaving *Δειπνιάς*, and travelling along the route prescribed in the first instance by divine direction, and ever after by use and observance, under the name of the sacred way, with all the leisure and solemnity which might be expected of a *Ἱομπή*, or procession, like this, in six

days more, that is, by the evening of August 25, to arrive at Delphi; on the day before the stated commencement of the games, August 26. And that this rule was always such as we have described; except that, as the epoch of the Pythian cycle itself was liable to advance one day with successive periods of 160 years, these stated dates, of the beginning and the ending of the sacred procession, would be liable to be advanced in the same proportion also, first, from August 18–25, to August 19–26, and so on.

And from this preliminary ceremony of the Pythian institution, more than from anything else peculiar to it, it would seem to be only a probable inference that though Philammon, the author of the institution, has been handed down as Philammon of Delphi, he was in reality a native of Thessaly. The distinction which he thus appears to have assigned to Thessaly, in making choice of the vale of Tempe for the scene of the purification of his Apollo, and for the first manifestation of his proper nature and dignity, and in particular his appointing that the laurels of Tempe should supply the materials of the sacred Καλιὰς, or booth, perpetually, and the triumphal procession of his Apollo itself, preliminary to his installation at Delphi, after setting out from the vale of Tempe, should make the circuit of Thessaly along the *ἱερά ὁδοῦς*, before it should arrive at Delphi, all this, as every unprejudiced judgment must allow, looks like the deliberate act of one who wished to do honour to his own country, and to vindicate to it the privilege of being the first to be taken under the guardianship of his Apollo, in return for having been the first to acknowledge his Apollo himself. And yet it is possible that there might have been another reason for this œconomy, derived from something peculiar to Thessaly itself, in comparison of the rest of Greece—something calculated to mark or designate it *a priori* as the fittest to be placed under the tutela of the Pythian Apollo, and to be specially assigned to him—and a reason which might have led the author of the Pythian institution, even though he had not been a native of Thessaly, to appoint that the solemnity should be ushered in by a preliminary circuit of Thessaly; though what that reason was we reserve for the present.

Lastly, even after these preliminary ceremonies, it would

still be the case that the Pythian celebrity, properly so called, would begin on the seventh of the solar, and on the seventh of the lunar, reckoning of the Pythian cycle, and therefore on the *seventh* day; and more especially would that be the case in the first instance of all. And this fact too appears to have been handed down traditionally, that the first Pythian festival was celebrated *κατὰ ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν*. Such at least is the statement of the first Pythian argument: *Ἔρχεται τοίνυν εἰς Δελφοὺς ὁ Ἀπόλλων...καὶ ἀποκτείνας τὸν ὄφιν τὸν Πυθῶνα ἀγωνίζεται τὸν Πυθικὸν ἀγῶνα, κατὰ ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν*. The comparison of the third argument will shew that this coming to Delphi and first celebration of the solemnity on the seventh day, here dated apparently as consecutive on the death of the Pytho, was really later than the retirement to Thessaly, the purification there, and the return to Delphi; and what is more, coincided with that season of the natural year when the fruits of the opora were ripe. The opora of the Greeks denoted the period from the second week in July to the second in September; and the first Pythian epoch, August 26, would fall critically in the midst of it.

We shall therefore conclude this part of our subject with proposing the scheme of the Pythian Ennead, in the first of its proper periods of 160 years; and the epochs of this first cycle being raised one day for every fresh period of 160 years, the type of the cycle through the first period will be competent to serve as that of the same through every subsequent period. We are at liberty to assume that the epoch of the Pythian cycle would be corrected in that manner, at the end of successive periods, just as much as any other; and it is necessary to assume that it must have been, in order to account for certain extant dates, derived from it, which cannot otherwise be explained.

SECTION X.—*Type of the Pythian Ennead, or Octaëteric Cycle of Philammon, adapted to successive Periods of 160 years, from Period i, B. C. 1222, to Period vi, B. C. 422.*

Type i. Period i. Cycle i.			Type ii. Period ii. Cycle i.		
B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.	B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.
1222	i	Aug. 26	1062	i	Aug. 27
*1221	ii	— 14	*1061	ii	— 5
1220	*iii	— 3	1060	*iii	— 4
1219	iv	— 22	1059	iv	— 23
1218	*v	— 11	1058	*v	— 12
*1217	vi	— 29	*1057	vi	— 30
1216	vii	— 18	1056	vii	— 19
1215	*viii	Aug. 7	1055	*viii	Aug. 8

  

Type iii. Period iii. Cycle i.			Type iv. Period iv. Cycle i.		
B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.	B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.
902	i	Aug. 28	742	i	Aug. 29
*901	ii	— 16	*741	ii	— 17
990	*iii	— 5	740	*iii	— 6
899	iv	— 24	739	iv	— 25
898	*v	— 13	738	*v	— 14
*897	vi	— 31	*737	vi	Sept. 1
896	vii	— 20	736	vii	Aug. 21
895	*viii	Aug. 9	735	*viii	Aug. 10

  

Type v. Period v. Cycle i.			Type vi. Per. vi. Cycle i.				
B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.	B. C.	Midnight.	B. C.	Cycle.	Midnight.
582	i	Aug. 30	542	Aug. 31	422	i	Sept. 1
*581	ii	— 18	*541	— 19	*421	ii	Aug. 20
580	*iii	— 7	540	— 8	420	*iii	— 9
579	iv	— 26	539	— 27	419	iv	— 28
578	*v	— 15	538	— 16	418	*v	— 17
*577	vi	Sept. 2	*537	Sept. 3	*417	vi	Sept. 4
576	vii	Aug. 22	536	Aug. 23	416	vii	Aug. 24
575	*viii	— 11	535	— 12	415	*viii	— 13

SECTION XI.—*On the Natalis of the ancient Thessaly; and on its coincidence with the epoch of the Pythian Institution.*

We shall now proceed to enlarge upon the hint, recently thrown out, that, without calling in question the probable

relation of Philammon himself to the ancient Thessaly, the true ultimate cause of the connection between the Pythian institution and the ancient Thessaly, assumed from the first, and illustrated and confirmed by the ceremonies of the institution itself, was a still more interesting fact, and still better calculated to account for this connection—the knowledge of which we attain to as follows.

First, it appears to have been handed down among the Greeks, as an old and well-authenticated tradition, that the whole of the plain of Thessaly, which even now is surrounded on all sides by mountains, the continuity of which is broken in one or two places only, was originally a lake, but that, through some convulsion of nature, an opening in this mountainous barrier having been made at the mouth of the Peneus, the waters of this lake were thereby discharged into the sea, and the surface of the country was laid bare. If that was ever the case, the existence of Thessaly as an habitable region must have borne date from this event; and the Julian date of the event (whatsoever it was) must have been in the strictest sense that of the *Natalis* or *Birthday* of the ancient Thessaly, that of the day on which it first saw the light and the sun. The coincidence to which we would bespeak the attention of the reader, and the proof of which we hope to make out as we proceed, is *this*; that the date of this recovery of the surface of the ancient Thessaly, from the state of an inland sea to that of a champaign and habitable country, was that of the Pythian institution—and the epoch of the Pythian institution, the *Natalis* of the Pythian Apollo, and the *Natalis* of the ancient Thessaly, were all the same.

We must begin with stating some of the testimonies of antiquity to the tradition in question.

ι. Ὡς τὴν δὲ Θεσσαλίην λόγος ἐστὶ τοπαλαιὸν εἶναι λίμνην, ὥστε γε συγκεκληθῆσμένην πάντοθεν ὑπερμήκεσι οὖρεσι. τὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ ἔχοντα τό τε Πήλιον οὖρος καὶ ἡ Ὅσσα ἀποκλήτει, συμμίγοντα τὰς ὑπωρείας ἀλλήλοισι· τὰ δὲ πρὸς βορέω ἀνέμου Οὐλυμπος· τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἐσπέρην Πίνδος· τὰ δὲ πρὸς μεσημβρίην τε καὶ ἀνεμον νότον ἡ Ὄθρυς. τὸ μέσον δὲ τουτέων τῶν λεχθέντων οὐρέων ἡ Θεσσαλίη ἐστὶ, ἐοῦσα κοίλῃ. ὥστε ὦν ποταμῶν καὶ ἄλλων συχνῶν ἐς αὐτὴν ἐσβαλλόντων, πέντε δὲ τῶν



δοκίμων μάλιστα τῶνδε. Πηρειῶ καὶ Ἀπιδανῶ καὶ Ὀροχῶνου καὶ Ἐριπέος καὶ Παμίσου· οἱ μὲν γιν' ἐς τὸ πεδίου τοῦτο συλλεγόμενοι ἐκ τῶν οὐρέων τῶν περικληϊόντων τὴν Θεσσαλίην οὐνομαζόμενοι, δι' ἐνὸς αὐλῶνος καὶ τούτου στενοῦ ἔκρουσι ἔχουσι ἐς θάλασσαν, προσυμμίσγοιτες τὸ ὕδωρ πάντες ἐς ταῦτό· ἐπεὶ δὲ συμμιχθέωσι τάχιστα, ἐνθεύτεν ἤδη ὁ Πηρειὸς τῷ οὐνόματι κατακρατέων ἀνωγύμους τοὺς ἄλλους ποιεῖ εἶναι. τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν λέγεται, οὐκ ἐόντος κω τοῦ αὐλῶνος καὶ διεκρούου τούτου, τοὺς ποταμοὺς τούτους, καὶ πρὸς τοῖσι ποταμοῖσι τούτοισι τὴν Βοιβηΐδα λίμνην, οὔτε οὐνομάζεσθαι κατὰπερ γῆν, ῥέειν δὲ οὐδὲν ἦσσαν ἢ γῆν· ῥέοντας δὲ ποιεῖν τὴν Θεσσαλίαν πᾶσαν πέλαγος. αὐτοὶ μὲν γῆν Θεσσαλοὶ φασὶ Ποσειδεῶνα ποιῆσαι τὸν αὐλῶνα δι' οὗ ῥέει ὁ Πηρειὸς, οἰκότα λέγοντες· ὅστις γὰρ νομίζει Ποσειδεῶνα τὴν γῆν σείειν, καὶ τὰ διεσπεῶτα ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου ἔργα εἶναι, καὶ ἐκεῖνο ἰδὼν φαίη Ποσειδεῶνα ποιῆσαι· ἔργον γὰρ ἐστὶ σεισμοῦ, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνεται, ἢ διάστασις τῶν οὐρέων.

ii. <sup>x</sup> Ταῦτα δὲ (Πήλιον καὶ Ὀσσα) ἐξήρηται μὲν ἰκανῶς· οὐ μὴν γε πολλὴν περιλαμβάνει κύκλω χώραν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ πεδία τελευτᾷ. ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μέσα τῆς Θεσσαλίας, εὐδαιμονοεστάτη χώρα, πλὴν ὅση ποταμόκλυστος ἐστίν. ὁ γὰρ Πηρειὸς, διὰ μέσης ῥέων καὶ πολλοὺς δεχόμενος ποταμοὺς, ὑπερεκχεῖται πολλάκις. τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν καὶ ἐλιμνάζετο ὡς λόγος τὸ πεδίου, ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν ὄρεισι περιειργόμενοι, καὶ τῆς παραλίας μετεωρότερα τῶν πεδίων ἐχούσης τὰ χωρία. ὑπὸ δὲ σεισμῶν ῥήγματος γειομένου (τὰ γῆν καλούμενα Τέμπη), καὶ τὴν Ὀσσαν ἀποσχίζοντος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀλύμπου, διεξέπεσε ταύτῃ πρὸς θάλασσαν ὁ Πηρειὸς, καὶ ἀνέψυξε τὴν χώραν ταύτην. ὑπολείπεται δ' ὅμως ἢ τε Νεσσωνὶς λίμνη μεγάλη, καὶ ἢ Βοιβηΐς, ἐλάττων ἐκείνης καὶ πλησιαιτέρα τῇ παραλίᾳ κ', τ. λ.

iii. <sup>v</sup> Αἰγυπτιάζει μὲν ἢ προβολὴ τῆς γραφῆς· ὁ λόγος δὲ αὐτὸς οὐκ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀλλ' οἶμαι Θεσσαλῶν. Αἰγυπτίοις μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὸν Νεῖλον ἢ γῆ· Θεσσαλοῖς δὲ Πηρειὸς οὐ συνεχώρει πάλαι γῆν ἔχειν. περιβεβλημένων τοῖς πεδίοις ὄρων, καὶ τοῦ ῥεύματος ἐπικλύζοντος αὐτὰ, ὑπὸ τοῦ μή πω ἐκβαλεῖν. ῥήξει γοῦν ὁ Ποσειδῶν τῇ τριαίνῃ τὰ ὄρη, καὶ πύλας τῷ ποταμῷ ἐργάσεται. τούτῳ γὰρ γιννὶ τῷ ἔργῳ ἐφέστηκεν, ἀθλῶν αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνακάλυπτων τὰ πεδία. καὶ διῆρηται μὲν ἢ χεῖρ εἰς τὸ ἀναρρῆσαι, τὰ δὲ ὄρη πρὶν πεπλήχθαι διίσταται τὸ ἀποχρῶν τῷ ποταμῷ μέτρον... τῷ τοι καὶ ἀσπάζεται τὰ πεδία, καὶ ὁμαλὰ ἰδὼν καὶ εὐρέα καθάπερ θαλάττας χαίρει. καὶ ὁ

<sup>x</sup> Strabo, ix. 5. 295 a.<sup>v</sup> Philostratus Jun. 800 B—801 B. Icones, ii. Θεσσαλία.

ποταμὸς ... ὁμολογεῖ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι ἐκρῆσεσθαι τῶν πεδίων ὕδῳ χρώμενος. ἀνίσχει καὶ ἡ Θετταλία, συνιζάνοντος ἤδη τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐλαία κομῶσα καὶ ἀστάχυι, καὶ πώλου ἐφαπτομένη συνανίσχοντος. ἔσται γὰρ καὶ ἵππος αὐτῇ παρ' αὐτοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, ὅταν τὴν ἀπορροὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καθεύδοντος ἡ γῆ ὑποδέξηται εἰς ἵππον<sup>z</sup>—Τοῦτο καὶ ἡ Εὐρώπη ποτὲ περὶ τὰ Τέμπη τὰ Θετταλικὰ ἔπαθε· σεισμοὶ γὰρ, κἀκείνην ἀναπτύξαντες τὴν ἁρμονίαν τῶν ὀρῶν, ἐναπεσημῆναντο τοῖς τμήμασι. καὶ πετρῶν τε οἴκοι φανεροὶ ἔτι παραπλήσιοι ταῖς ἐξηρμοσμέναις σφῶν πέτραις, ὕλη θ' ὀπόση σχισθέντων τῶν ὀρῶν ἐπισπένθαι εἰκὸς οὐπω ἄδηλος· λείπονται γὰρ δι' ἔτι αἱ εὐναὶ τῶν δένδρων<sup>a</sup>.

iv.<sup>b</sup> Thessaliam, qua parte diem brumalibus horis  
 Adtollit Titan, rupes Ossæa coercet :  
 Cum per summa poli Phœbum trahit altior æstas,  
 Pelion obponit radiis nascentibus umbras.  
 At medios ignes cœli, rabidique Leonis  
 Solstitiale caput, nemorosus submovet Othrys.  
 Excipit adversos Zephyros et Iapyga Pindus,  
 Et maturato præcidit vespere lucem.  
 Nec metuens imi Borean habitator Olympi  
 Lucentem totis ignorat noctibus Arcton.  
 Hos inter montes, media qua valle premuntur,  
 Perpetuis quondam latuere paludibus agri,  
 Flumina dum campi retinent, nec pervia Tempe  
 Dant aditus pelago, stagnumque inplentibus unum  
 Crescere cursus erat. postquam decessit Olympo  
 Herculea gravis Ossa manu, subitæque ruinam  
 Sensit aquæ Nereus, melius mansura sub undis,  
 Emathis æquorei regnum Pharsalus Achillis  
 Eminent.

v.<sup>c</sup> Sic cum Thessaliam scopulis inclusa teneret  
 Peneo stagnante palus, et mersa negarent  
 Arva coli, trifida Neptunus cuspidē montes  
 Impulit adversos. tum fortī saucius ictu  
 Dissiluit gelido vertex Ossæus Olympo,  
 Carceribus laxantur aquæ, fractoque meatu  
 Redduntur fluviusque mari tellusque colonis.

Now that this tradition commemorated an actual matter of fact might be inferred first, (with great probability,) from the natural peculiarities of Thessaly itself, even at the present day, which are such as to satisfy any geographer, or

<sup>z</sup> Cf. Schol. in Pind. ad Pyth. iv. 246 : Virgil, Georg. i. 12, and Servius in loc.

<sup>a</sup> Icones, ii. 805 B. C. Insulæ.

<sup>b</sup> Lucan. Phars. vi. 333.

<sup>c</sup> Claudian. De Raptu, ii. 179.

geologist, that nothing could be more probable than that the whole of this part of Greece was once an inland sea. Certain at least it is that it is still surrounded by a barrier of mountains on every side, which intercept and exclude all communication with the interior of the country and the sea, except through the mouth of the Peneus; and that, as Xerxes is supposed by Herodotus to have observed<sup>d</sup>, when he visited this outlet on his way through Thessaly to Athens, could the mouth of the Peneus by any means be stopped up, if the plain of Thessaly was once before a great lake of water, it would soon be reduced to the same state again.

ii. With still greater certainty, from the fact that the Thes-salians themselves had an institution of their own, which came into being out of the fact thus traditionally handed down; and was originally intended as a memorial of it, and observed in that capacity down to the latest times. This institution was the Thessalian Πελώρια, of which Athenæus has preserved the following account from Bato of Sinope<sup>e</sup>.

Βάτων δὲ ὁ Σινοπεὺς ὁ ρήτωρ ἐν τῷ περὶ Θεσσαλίας καὶ Αἰμονίας σαφῶς ἐμφανίζει τὴν τῶν Σατουρναλίων ἑορτὴν Ἑλληνικωτάτην, φάσκων αὐτὴν παρὰ τοῖς Θεσσαλοῖς Πελώρια καλεῖσθαι, γράφων οὕτως.

Θυσίας κοινῆς τοῖς Πελασγοῖς γινομένης, ἀναγγεῖλαι τινα τῷ Πελασγῷ ἄνδρα, ᾧ ὄνομα ἦν Πέλωρος, διότι ἐν τῇ Αἰμονίᾳ σεισμῶν μεγάλων γενομένων βραγείη τὰ Τέμπη ὄρη ὀνομαζόμενα, καὶ διότι διὰ τοῦ διαστήματος ὀρμήσαν τὸ τῆς λίμνης ὕδωρ ἐμβάλλου εἰς τὸ τοῦ Πηνειοῦ ρεῖθρον, καὶ τὴν πρότερον λιμνάζουσαν χώραν ἅπασαν γεγυμνῶσθαι, καὶ ἀναξηραινομένων τῶν ὑδάτων πεδία θαυμαστὰ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει ἀναφαίνεσθαι. ἀκούσαντα οὖν τὸν Πελασγόν, τὴν τράπεζαν ἀφθόρως αὐτῷ κεκοσμημένην τῷ Πελώρῳ παραθεῖναι. καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους δὲ φιλοφρονομένους ἕκαστον φέρειν ὅ τι ἔχοι παρ' αὐτῷ βέλτιστον, καὶ παρατιθέναι ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τῷ ἀπαγγεῖλαντι. καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Πελασγὸν προθύμως διακοιεῖν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς ἐν ὀξυώματι ὄντας ὑπηρετεῖν, καθότι ἐκάστῳ ὁ καιρὸς παρέπιπτε. διὸ περ φασίν, ἐπεὶ τὴν χώραν κατέσχον, ἀπομίμημα τῆς τότε γενομένης ἑορτῆς, θύοντας Διὶ Πελώρῳ, τραπέζας τε λαμπρῶς κοσμοῦντας προτιθέναι, καὶ οὕτως φιλόφθωρον τὴν παιήγυριν συντελεῖν, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ξένους ἅπαντας ἐπὶ τὴν θοῦνην

<sup>d</sup> vii. 128-130.

<sup>e</sup> xiv. 45. cf. Eustathius, ad Il. P. 132. 1098, 57.

παραλαμβάνειν, καὶ τοὺς δεσμώτας λύειν, καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας κατακλίναντας μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἔστιαν, διακουούτων αὐτοῖς τῶν δεσποτῶν· καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἔτι καὶ νῦν Θεσσαλοὺς μεγίστην ἑορτὴν ἄγοντας προσαγορεύειν Πελωρίαν.

That the Thessalians therefore had an observance, the first institution, and the historical use and purpose, of which the national tradition and belief connected with this event—of the conversion of their own country from an expanse of waters into an habitable region—on the strength of this testimony we are bound to believe: and that the proper name of this observance, both at first and ever after, was that of the Πελώρια, we are also bound to believe. But that it derived this name, not from the nature of the event commemorated by it, but from the name of some individual of the time, who first brought the news of the event to the king of the country, we are not bound, on the strength of the preceding account, to believe—and we have only to consider the nature of the event itself, and the proper meaning of the name supposed to have been given to the institution which commemorated it, to see that nothing is necessary to account for the name of the observance, but the event.

Πελώριος is regularly derivable in Greek from Πέλωρ; and πέλωρ, according to Hesychius, was μέγα, ὑπερφυές: πελώριος, derived from it, was μέγας, δεινός; and πελώρια, the neuter plural of πελώριος, was synonymous with δεινὰ τέρατα\*. The proper sense of this word then was that of the surprising, the marvellous, the extraordinary; of anything beside and beyond the usual course of things. And what could be more so than the emergence of Thessaly from the bottom of the sea, under which it had lain so long concealed—the sudden conversion of an immense inland lake into an habitable country, and the means by which it was effected, the power, (scarcely less than omnipotent,) necessary to burst in sunder the mountainous barrier which had so long confined these waters, and drowned Thessaly—and the timely application of

\* Homer applies this epithet of πελώριος to his Cyclops—

Ἐνθα δ' ἀνήρ ἐνίαιε πελώριος—

Od. I. 188. Cf. II. P. 174, where it is applied to Ajax. It is applied to both, because of their gigantic size and stature. It is in fact of repeated occurrence in the Iliad and the Odyssey for anything extraordinary of its kind.

that power, to make a way for their escape just at the destined moment of the Natalis of Thessaly. Here was a concurrence of circumstances, which might well deserve the name of Πελώρια, and might well give such a name to the institution commemorative of them.

Nor is it any objection to the substantial truth of this traditional account of the origin of the Thessalian Peloria, that it is supposed to have taken its rise in the time of a certain Pelasgus. This implies only that its true time went back to a very remote antiquity. We have often had occasion to declare our opinion, that the Pelasgi of Greek tradition, except as the supposed representatives of the first race of the inhabitants of the world, never had a real existence. They were κατ' ἐξοχήν the "men of the Sea," the "men of the Flood"—whose proper place and time lay beyond the Deluge and the second beginning of things, in the antediluvian world: and any individual Πελασγός, especially as the king of a country, and the head of a people, (like the Pelasgus of this Thessalian tradition,) can be regarded only as the impersonation of an antediluvian abstraction. Nothing was more natural than that the oldest events of their history should be referred by the later Greeks to the times of these Pelasgi; and in particular among the Thessalians, an event like that commemorated by their own Peloria, which was literally connected with the Deluge, and in the case of their own country was the actual undoing, so long after, of that which had been actually done by the Deluge, so long before.

It does not appear that anything is known of the author from whom the above account was taken; but it is clear, from the account itself, that he must have lived in the Roman æra, and at a time when many of the lunar calendars of the Greeks had passed into the Roman or Julian. It is very important to observe that Athenæus' object in referring to, and quoting his testimony, was to illustrate the history of the Roman Saturnalia, and to prove by examples of the fact itself, that even these were of Hellenic origin, or at least did not differ from similar observances of the Greeks themselves, celebrated if not under the same name, yet at the same time of the year, and even on the same days of the month †. And

† Cf. Vol. ii. 507 sqq.

in fact, according to Eustathius, in this particular instance of the Thessalian Peloria, Bato, the author himself, must have distinctly asserted that they were the same with the Roman Saturnalia: *Καὶ ἦγον Θεσσαλοὶ μεγίστην ἐκείνην ἑορτὴν, προσ-αγορεύοντες Πελωρίαν καὶ ἦν. φησὶν, ἡ αὐτὴ τῇ τῶν Σατουρναλίῳν ε.*

From this positive assurance of Bato's then, of the identity of these two observances, it must be a necessary inference that the date of the Thessalian Peloria and that of the Roman Saturnalia in his time were the same, and if that of the latter was December 17, that of the former must have been December 17 too; i. e. some day in its proper calendar the same with December 17 in the Roman. And that would be explained, if before his time the Thessalian calendar had passed into the Roman—as, from the peculiarity of its epoch, Jan. 2, or at the latest Jan. 3, it was predisposed to do\*.

\* The first month of the National Lunar Calendar of Thessaly (see Vol. ii. 478 sqq.) appears to have been called Βώμιος, and the last Βουκάτιος. On that principle, the stated Pelorian month in that calendar must have been Bucatius, and the stated Pelorian date in that month the 17th.

The administration of the Thessalian calendar, from the date of the adoption of their proper Lunar Correction, Jan. 2, B. C. 517, as we have seen (Vol. ii. 457 sqq.), is very obscure; though we appear to have rendered it probable that its original octaëteric Type was retained for two Periods of 160 years, at least, and the Metonic Correction was not substituted for it earlier than B. C. 197. But whether the original epoch of the Octaëteric Correction, Jan. 2, at the end of those two Periods, was raised to Jan. 3, must always be an uncertain point; though from the analogy of similar cases in other instances, and until proof to the contrary should come to light from any other quarter, we are at liberty to assume, if necessary, that it was.

On this supposition, the epoch of the Metonic Correction would be Jan. 3, B. C. 197: the consequence of which would be, that the third Calippic period of this Correction and the Julian Correction of the dictator Cæsar would meet together B. C. 45—the former Jan. 3, B. C. 45, the latter Dec. 30, B. C. 46: and the former being supposed administered for the next three years, according to the regular rule of the Metonic Correction, and the latter, *de facto*, as it appears to have been, and as it is represented in our Tables (Orig. Kal. Ital. iv. lxxxii)—the consequence

ε Ad II. P. 174. 1101, 26. It is very observable that Athenæus' quotation, relating to this subject, *supra*, p. 724, ended with *Πελωρίαν*. What follows

here in Eustathius, *καὶ ἦν φησὶν κ', τ. λ.* is not given in Athenæus. It must consequently have been taken by Eustathius directly from Bato.

Assuming then that all the dates in the calendar, to which particular observances were attached while it was lunar, and especially this of the Peloria (the principal observance of the calendar itself), were nominally retained when the lunar calendar passed into the Julian; we may reason from this assumption as follows. If the 17th of December, or what is the same thing, the 17th of the last month, was the proper date of the Thessalian Peloria in the Julian calendar of Thessaly, derived from the lunar; the 17th of the last month must have been the stated Pelorian date in the lunar calendar. And from this fact we may argue in like manner that, as this lunar calendar itself was derived from the primitive solar one, its stated Pelorian date was derived from that calendar too. And thus, by means of a series of inferences, each of them logically deducible from the preceding, and all resting ultimately on the truth of a matter of fact, made known by contemporary testimony, (viz. that there was no difference, except in name, between the Thessalian Peloria and the Roman Saturnalia,) we arrive at a conclusion of great importance on the present question; viz. that the original date of the Thessalian Peloria, in the primitive equable calendar, (the calendar to which it must have been consigned at first, and from which it must have been transferred to the lunar,) was the 17th of the last month, the 17th of the primitive Mesore.

would be, that the first of Bomius in the Thessalian calendar, Period iii. 4, Cycle ix. 4, and the Kalends of Januarius, in the fourth year of the Julian Æra at Rome, would both meet on the 31 December, B. C. 43.

Censorinus told us (Origg. Kal. Ital. ii. 670) that the Julian Correction was established in some of the dependencies of the Empire, even in Cæsar's lifetime; and Thessaly, ever since the battle of Pydna (Origg. Kal. Ital. iii. 164), having become as completely a part of it as any, probably the Julian calendar would be received there as soon as anywhere. The above explanation shews that its own calendar might have been in a condition to pass into the Julian, in the sense of the Roman, as early as Dec. 31, B. C. 43: and if the Julian Calendar, in the sense of the Roman, was actually adopted at that time, with merely the Thessalian names of the months instead of the Roman, the stated Pelorian date, the 17th Bucatius, that very year, would become identical with the stated Saturnalian one, Dec. 17; and the Thessalian Calendar, as identified with the Julian, having been subjected *de facto* from that time forward to the same administration as the Julian, it would never after differ from it.

Now the date of the Thessalian Peloria, as we have already observed<sup>h</sup>, from the nature of the case, must have been that of the Natalis of Thessaly. Let us then, at this stage of our inquiries, revert to the coincidence, with the supposition of which we set out; viz. that the epoch of the Pythian institution, the Natalis of the Pythian Apollo, and the Natalis of Thessaly, having all been the same, *that* was the true explanation of the connection between the Pythian institution, and the ancient Thessaly, which appeared in the most characteristic ceremonies of the institution itself. In this case, the equable date of the Natalis of Thessaly having been determined to Mesore 17, and the Julian date of the Pythian epoch, and of the Natalis of the Pythian Apollo, having been determined to August 26; the Julian date of the Natalis of Thessaly must have been August 26 also. And if these assumptions have any foundation to rest upon, their confirmation will be found in the fact that, in the true year of the event commemorated by the Thessalian Peloria, Mesore 17 in the equable style, and August 26 in the Julian, met together and coincided.

Now, if Mesore 17 is to fall on August 26, Mesore 1 must fall on August 10, and Thoth 1 on September 14. Let us then go back to the last instance of any such coincidence before the time of Philammon of Delphi. It will be found in *Æra cyclica* 2425, when Thoth 1, as our Tables shew, entered Sept. 15 at midnight, B. C. 1582, and Mesore 1, August 10 at midnight, B. C. 1581, the year in question having been leap-year in the Julian reckoning, and the equable style having dropt one day in the Julian, between September 15 at midnight, B. C. 1582, and August 10 at midnight, B. C. 1581.

Now the year, distinguished by this coincidence, B. C. 1582–1581, and the first of the epochs of the Parian marble, as those entries all stand at present, within one year are the same, and with the correction of those entries, down to a certain time, pointed out on a former occasion<sup>i</sup>, they are altogether the same. And this first epoch is one of the few at present which have come down entire, and are still read

<sup>h</sup> Pag. 720.

<sup>i</sup> Vol. i. 189 : ii. 28.



on the marble as they proceeded from the author of the compilation: 'Αφ' οὗ Κέκροψι 'Αθηναίων ἐβασίλευσε, καὶ ἡ χώρα Κεκροπία ἐκλήθη, τὸ πρότερον καλουμένη 'Ακτικῇ, ἀπὸ 'Ακταίου τοῦ αὐτόχθονος, ἔτη ΧΙΗΗΗΔΠΙΗ (1318)<sup>k</sup>; which, being referred to the archonship of Diognetus, B. C. 264, gives the date of this first entry uncorrected B. C. 1582, and with the correction adverted to, B. C. 1581.

It will no doubt however be objected that this entry, as it stands on the marble, is the date of the reign of Cecrops in Attica, not that of the Natalis of Thessaly, or of the Thessalian Peloria. But if we look at the preface of all these entries, just before, we shall not think there is much weight in that objection. This too is in a great measure entire; and it plainly appears from it that the object of this first entry was to define the earliest point in Grecian antiquity to which the researches of the author had been able to carry him back—and it is entirely *per accidens* that it happens to be proposed as the starting point of Attic history in particular, instead of that of Greek history in general. The Cecrops of Attic tradition, except as the connecting link between the antediluvian and the postdiluvian world, and possibly among the Greeks as the traditionary representative of the patriarch Noah, never had a real existence<sup>l</sup>. And assuming the Pelasgus of the Thessalian tradition and the Cecrops of the Attic to have represented alike the absolute beginning of the national history in each, there were too many points of resemblance between them, not to allow them to be regarded as the same person under a different name. But the true beginning of Grecian history is not the epoch of a fabulous reign, like this of Cecrops, but an historical matter of fact, attested by the geographical characters, the local traditions, and the peculiar national institutions, of the country itself—the draining of the great lake of Thessaly; out of which not only the geographical and historical Thessaly, with its different possessors at different times, but the names and distinctions of Hellas and Hellenes themselves ultimately took their rise. It was this which opened the way, by land at least—not only to the colonisation of Thessaly itself, but of those parts of Grecia proper, on the south of the pass of

<sup>k</sup> Marmor Parium, Epocha i.

<sup>l</sup> Vol. iv. 125.

Thermophylæ, which afterwards cut the principal figure in Greek history; 200 years and upwards before the coming of Cadmus into Bœotia, or of Danaus to Argos, or of Erechtheus to Attica, or of the Arkites to Arcadia, or of any others from abroad, the mixture of whom, with the inhabitants of the country, found in possession of it at the time of their arrival, gave birth to the oldest and most illustrious members of the great Hellenic community of aftertimes.

Though then we would not undertake to say that the coincidence, just pointed out, between the date of the Thessalian Peloria, determined as we have determined it, and this first of the epochs on the Parian Marble, may not, after all, have been accidental; we consider it much more probable that the time of the Thessalian Pelasgus was purposely assumed therein as that of the Attic Keceps, and the beginning of Hellenic history in general as that of Attic in particular. Meanwhile, the fact will still hold good that the Natalis of the ancient Thessalia must have borne date on the Thessalian Peloria, and the date of the Thessalian Peloria must have been the 17th of the Primitive Mesore. And the fact will still hold good that, whatsoever the Natalis of the ancient Thessaly, in the apprehension of the founder of the Pythian institution there was the closest connection between the Apollo of that institution, and the ancient Thessaly; which nothing can explain so naturally as the supposition that the Natalis of the Pythian Apollo and the Natalis of the ancient Thessaly were the same. It requires no argument to prove that, if the birthday of the Pythian Apollo and the birthday of Thessaly were the same, Thessaly might be considered the birthright of the Pythian Apollo from the first—especially if (as we are at liberty to assume) the Apollo of the Pythian institution, in the system of Philammon, was the Supreme Principle and the impersonation of the sun; to whose interposition, the very œconomy, wonderful as it was, by which Thessaly itself had been brought into existence, (in the shape of a region fit for the inhabitation and enjoyment of men,) was ultimately due\*.

\* The above conclusions respecting the truth of the ancient tradition relating to Thessaly, and even the date which we have seen reason to assign to the Natalis of that country itself, may be confirmed by some

further arguments, each of them entitled to much consideration in itself, and all together calculated to place this ancient tradition out of question.

These arguments are four; The names of Thessaly; The institution of the Amphictyonic Council; The flood of Deucalion and the *Μισαράι ἡμέραι* of the Attic Calendar; The relation of the last month in the Primitive Greek Calendar to Posidon in particular. Of each of these in its order.

i. The names of Thessaly. We propose to exemplify the nature and application of the argument, derivable from this source, in five or six of the names of the ancient Thessaly: and first in these three, *Αἰμονία*, *Πύρρα*, and *Ἡμαθία*.

i. *Αἰμονία*.

Ἔστι τις αἰπεινοῖσι περιδρομος οὔρεσι γαῖα,  
πάμπαν εὐρρηγός τε καὶ εὐβοτός· ἔνθα Προμηθεὺς  
Ἰαπετιονίδης ἀγαθὸν τέκε Δευκαλίωνα·  
ὃς πρῶτος ποίησε πόλεις καὶ ἐδείματο νηοὺς  
ἀθανάτοις, πρῶτος δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπων βασιλεύσεν.  
Αἰμονίην δὴ τήνδε περικτίονες καλέουσιν<sup>1</sup>.

ii. *Πύρρα*.

Πύρραν δήποτε τήνγε παλαιότεροι καλέεσκον,  
Πύρρης Δευκαλίωνος ἀπ' ἀρχαίης ἀλόχοιο·  
Αἰμονίην δ' ἐξ' αὐτῆς ἀφ' Αἴμονος, ὃν ῥά Πελασγὸς  
γεῖνατο φέρτατον υἱόν· ὁ δ' αὖ τέκε Θεσσαλὸν Αἴμων,  
τοῦ δ' ἄπο Θεσσαλίην λαοὶ μετεφημίξαντο<sup>2</sup>.

iii. *Ἡμαθία*.—Πρότερον γὰρ Ἡμαθία ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ νῦν Θεσσαλία<sup>3</sup>.

The above names then being supposed three of the oldest by which Thessaly appears to have been known to the ancients themselves; two of them, *Αἰμονία* and *Πύρρα*, it is evident, must have been of cognate signification, one derived from *αἴμων*, *sanguineus*, the other from *πυρρός*, *ruber*, *rufus*. And it would be an obvious explanation of each, that it must have been taken from the natural appearance of the surface of Thessaly, as soon as it was laid bare by the retirement of the waters, and before it had yet been covered by any description of vegetation. For though no one, in the absence of contemporary testimony, could venture to say what must have been the appearance presented by the bottom of the Lake of Thessaly, when first drained and laid bare, nearly three thousand five hundred years ago, it stands to reason that if it exhibited any peculiar appearance, its first distinctive appellation would probably be taken from it.

And this explanation of the probable origin of the first two of these names is strongly confirmed by that of the third. Had that name come down in the form of *Ἡμαθία*, no one would have hesitated to derive it from *ἄμαθος*, and to understand the country so called literally as the land of *ἄμαθος*; between which and *ψάμμος* or *ψάμαθος* the old grammarians

<sup>1</sup> Apoll. Rhod. iii. 1084. Cf. Hesychius, in *Αἰμονία*: Steph. Byz. *Αἰμονία*: Pliny, H. N. iv. 14: and the Schol. on Apollon. in loc.

<sup>2</sup> Rhianus, apud Schol. in Apollon. Rhod. loco citato.

<sup>3</sup> Schol. in Thucyd. i. 2: cf. Servius, ad Georg. i. 492: Catullus, ixiv. 325.

draw *this* distinction, viz. that ἄμαθος denoted ἡ (μεσόγυλλος corr.) μεσόγειος ἄμμος, ψάμμος or ψάμαθος that of the seashore<sup>4</sup>. Ἄμαθία, on this principle, must have meant “the region of inland, or mediterranean sand” —and a more probable name than that for the plain of Thessaly, when first laid bare, can scarcely be imagined. Even in subsequent times, the superficial appearance of this plain, as first seen from the city of Thaumaci, at the mouth of the pass of Cæle or Cœla, where the road from Thermopylæ, after traversing the defiles of mount Othrys, first entered the vale of Thessaly, according to Livy<sup>5</sup>, could be compared to nothing but a boundless expanse of sea; and its appearance at first, still destitute of covering of any kind, and for a long time after, must have been literally that of the bed of the sea, abandoned far and wide by its waters. If we may assume that the lake of Thessaly included originally the parts between mount Othrys and mount Cœta, as well as those between mount Othrys and mount Olympus, (the latter of which properly constituted the vale of Thessaly,) and that the same convulsion of nature, which laid bare the plain of Thessaly, emptied these parts also; it will be far from improbable that, of these ancient names, Αἰμονία and Πύρρα were given originally to the part between mount Othrys and mount Cœta, and that of Ἄμαθία to the other, between mount Othrys and mount Olympus. This part, between mount Othrys on the north, and mount Cœta on the south, was the Melian district of after-times, or vale of the Spercheius. And one of the tributaries of this river had the name of Phœnix, derived from the colour of its waters; and that must have been due to the natural peculiarities of the soil through which they flowed. Or though the lake of Thessaly should have been strictly coextensive only with the plain of Thessaly, if there was any reason for giving this plain the name of Ἄμαθία, there might be the same for giving it that of Αἰμονία or Πύρρα; for a sandy surface must have been more or less a red one too. And this name of Ἄμαθία having once been given to any part of Thessaly, the poets would soon find it necessary, for their own convenience, to lengthen the first syllable, just as much as in ἀθάνατος, ἀκάματος, or the like. And Ἄμαθία, with the first syllable long, would be regarded and treated ever after as the Doric form of Ἕμαθία.

Secondly, in three more, Ἑλλάς, Ἑλλοπία, and Θεσσαλία.

i. Ἑλλάς. That this name, though in the course of time the recognised denomination for the whole of the country of the Greeks, was originally the local name of a part of Thessaly, is too generally admitted to require to be proved<sup>6</sup>. With respect then to the etymon and meaning of the name itself; in the first place, Ἑλλάς is the feminine form of the masculine Ἑλλός, and derived from it according to the analogy of a multitude of similar forms, some of which we collected on a former occasion<sup>7</sup>. In the next place, the proper meaning of Ἑλλάς, so derived, is that of the land of the Ἑλλοί. Thirdly, that there was anciently a people called

<sup>4</sup> Hesychius, in voce. Cf. Suidas, Ἄμαθος ἡ τῆς πεδιάδος κόνις. ψάμαθος δὲ ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης.

<sup>5</sup> xxii. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Vol. i. 218, n.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. iv. 599.

Ἴλλοι, and that they were inhabitants of the ancient Thessaly, and consequently that the land of the Ἴλλοι must have been somewhere in that country too, may be collected from Homer.

Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,  
 Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρον, ἀμφὶ δέ σ' Ἴλλοι  
 σοὶ ναίουσ' ἵποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι <sup>8</sup>.

For that the Dodona of Homer was the name of a locality in Thessaly, and that he knew nothing, (or at least has said nothing \*,) of the Dodona in Epirus, may be inferred from his account of Γουνεὺς (a Thessalian chief) and his followers.

Οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί' ἔθεντο,  
 οἷ τ' ἀμφ' ἵμερτὸν Τιταρήσιον ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο <sup>9</sup>.

We are aware indeed that in the first of these passages, instead of ἀμφὶ δέ σ' Ἴλλοι, many of the learned at the present day would read ἀμφὶ δέ Σελλοί, as the name of the people and prophets of Zeus in this instance; and that these Σελλοί are recognised as an actual people by some of the ancients themselves, and very probably on the strength of what was read in this place, in Homer, in their time. It is certain however that critical authority is as much in favour of the reading of σ' Ἴλλοι, as of that of Σελλοί; and that most of the scholiasts and commentators of antiquity read it so in their time, appears from their observations on the passage. What then was the meaning of this name of Ἴλλοί? Hesychius has Ἐλλόν . . . ἐνθαλάττιον . . . ἄφωνον· ἕγγρον—Ἐλλός. . . καὶ Δωδωναίος. καὶ ὁ ἐνθαλάττιος. The term then, as an appellative, denoted properly the inhabitants of the sea, or the creatures which were mute, or the creatures which lived in water: the two latter, it is evident, virtually included under the first, the inhabitants of the sea. And this being the case, though no one could doubt that the first and proper meaning of Ἴλλοί must have been that of the fishes of the sea; yet without pressing the literal sense of the term too closely, every one must acknowledge that it might very naturally have been applied to the first settlers, or to any subsequent body of settlers, in a country which had been originally a sea. The settlers in such a country, and especially the first of the number, would be literally Ἐνθαλάττιοι, settlers and dwellers in a region which had been once a sea, and therefore, if Ἴλλοί denoted Ἐνθαλάττιοι, *virtute termini* strictly and properly Ἴλλοί.

\* An allusion to Dodona indeed occurs Od. Ξ. 327. T. 296, which is generally understood of the Dodona in Epirus. But to our judgment this reference of it is far from clear; and we should be decidedly of opinion the same Dodona is meant in all these instances—Dodona in Thessaly—not Dodona in Epirus, or among the Θεσπρωτοί. Cf. also the fragment of Hesiod, Strabo, vii. 7. 125 a:

Δωδώνην φηγόν τε Πελασγῶν ἔδρανον ἦεν—

And Hesychius, Ἐλλά, and Ἐλα: Schol. ad Trachinias, 1169.

<sup>8</sup> Iliad. Π. 233-235.

<sup>9</sup> Iliad. B. 750.

ii. Ἑλλοπία. That this too was one of the ancient names of Thessaly, appears from a fragment of Hesiod's, quoted by the scholiast on the Trachiniæ of Sophocles <sup>10</sup>.

Ἔστι τις Ἑλλοπία πολυλήϊος ἠδ' εὐλείμμων,

ἔνθα(τε) Δωδώνη τις ἐπ' ἔσχατῆ πεπόλισται.

And from its being joined here with the same Dodona as the Ἑλλάς, or land of the Ἑλλοί, in Homer, it may be reasonably inferred that this Ἑλλοπία of Hesiod, and the Ἑλλάς of Homer, must have been only different names for the same locality. And that is strongly confirmed by the etymon of this Ἑλλοπία itself—which is evidently neither more nor less than the land of the Ἑλλοπες, and these Ἑλλοπες neither more nor less than the Ἑλλοί of Homer. For Ἑλλοπες, according to Hesychius, denoted simply the Ἑλλείποντες τῆς ὀπός—τουτέστιν, ἄφθογοι, ἄφωνοι: and the Ἑλλοί of Homer, understood of the Ἐνθαλάττιοι, or inhabitants of the sea, were ἄφωνοι too. And Ἑλλοπιεῖς according to Hesychius, denoted οἱ λεπιδωτοί also, a still clearer designation of the inhabitants of the sea, in the sense of fish: and he derives Ἑλλοπίδας itself παρὰ τοῦς Ἑλλούς.

There was no difference then between the Ἑλλοπία of Hesiod and the Ἑλλάς of Homer. Both were meant of a part of Thessaly, and both of the same part, that about Dodona, wheresoever that was. Both denoted the land of the Ἑλλοί, and both by these Ἑλλοί first and properly the inhabitants of a land which, though a *terra firma* in their time, was once a sea, and very probably when these Ἑλλοί first settled in it had scarcely yet passed from the state of a sea, to that of a continent, or *terra firma*.

iii. Θεσσαλία. The geographical and historical name of Thessaly itself. There would be little difference between such a name as Θεσσαλία and such an one as Θασσαλία: and if the name of Thessaly had come down in the form of Θασσαλία, no one, who had the least experience in tracing the derivation of names, and investigating the process by which they may be seen to have passed from one shape to another, would have had any difficulty in deriving Θασσαλία from Θαλασσία, and consequently, ultimately from Θάλασσα. So that the proper meaning of this name, which in the course of time became the only one by which the ancient Thessaly was recognised in history and geography, and by which alone it is still known, resolved into its first principles, would be neither more nor less than that of the *sea-land*, the land which had once been sea, and had afterwards become dry land. We see no objection to this definition of the name on grammatical principles; and it is the most agreeable of all to the historical or traditionary account of the origin of the country so called: and it has a parallel in modern times, in the name of the country of the Dutch, which once was sea too, and is still called Zealand, or sea-land, and Holland, or Hollow-land, to mark what it once was, though it has long ceased to be so. Ancient Thessaly was the Zealand of ancient Greece.

<sup>10</sup> Ad ver. 1169. cf. Strabo, vii. 7. 125.

This name itself would be substantially the same with Hellas, as denoting by implication the sea-land too, by denoting the land of those who were inhabitants of the sea: and if both were substantially the same, it is easy to see that for many reasons this name of Thessaly in the course of time would be likely to supersede that of Hellas, in Thessaly itself at least. Whether it were a reasonable inference from the language of Thucydides, (*Ἡ τε νῦν Θεσσαλία καλούμενη*<sup>11</sup>), that as the name of the whole of the country it had not long come into vogue before his time, we would not undertake to say; but we may observe that the name of *Θεσσαλία* occurs nowhere in Homer, and in the only instance in which he refers to that part of Greece, (viz. in the description of the followers of Achilles<sup>12</sup>), he calls it, *Τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος*—which is much the same as if he had called it the Argos which was once a sea\*. And yet it would be precarious to infer from his silence in this respect, that the name of *Θεσσαλία* could not yet have been in being in his time, or that he himself was ignorant of it: especially as the *nomen gentile* of the country, in the shape of a proper name, *Θεσσαλὸς*, a son of Hercules, and father of two of the chiefs in the Trojan war, (Pheidippus and Antiphus,) does occur in him<sup>13</sup>, and by some of the ancients was taken for that of the Eponym of Thessaly itself<sup>14</sup>. In our opinion, it is a more probable explanation of his silence about this name, that he knew it to be virtually the same with that of *Ἑλλάς*, an older name, and long received into use in his time, if not for the whole, yet for a part of Thessaly, and very possibly the oldest part, the part first occupied by settlers, after the land became capable of colonisation; that consequently, which was on every account to be considered the true Thessaly, the germ and cradle of the rest of the country so called. It was not necessary therefore for Homer, who repeatedly recognises this name of Hellas<sup>15</sup>, to specify that of Thessalia also.

ii. The institution of the Amphictyonic council. The institution of this celebrated council, (the first instance of a federal union, or a representative government, recorded in history,) is traditionally attributed to Amphictyon, the son or grandson of Deucalion<sup>16</sup>, or to Acrisius, the father

\* Cf. Herod. ii. 56: Apollon. Rhod. i. 580, and the Scholia. In the idiom of Homer, Argos is the name for the country of the Greeks in general, and Argos, with a limiting epithet, is that of some principal division of that country in particular. The only distinctions however in the application and meaning of the term so used, recognised by him *de facto*, are these four, *Ἄργος μέσον*, *Ἄργος Ἀχαϊκόν*, *Ἄργος Ἰασον*, and *Ἄργος Πελασγικόν*, (see H. T. 115: Od. A. 344: Γ. 251: O. 80: Σ. 245); the first denoting the middle of the Peloponnese, the second the south, the third the west, and the fourth the plain of Thessaly. See Mr. Gladstone's *Studies on Homer*, i. 380.

11 i. 2.

12 Iliad. B. 681 sqq. cf. Strabo, ix. 5. 297 b: Pliny, H. N. iv. 14.

13 Iliad. B. 678.

14 Schol. in Apollon. Rhod. iii. 1089. cf. Steph. Byz. *Θεσσαλία*: Velleius, Pat. i. 3: Polyænus, i. 12: viii. 44:

Herod. vii. 176.

15 H. B. 683: T. 395. 447: Π. 595: Od. A. 344: Δ. 726. 816: Δ. 496: O. 80.

16 Marmor. Par. Epocha v: Harpocration and Suidas, *Ἀμφικτύονες*: Pausanias, x. viii. 1.

of Perseus<sup>17</sup>; the latter of whom was an historical personage, but the former can be regarded only as the Eponym of the institution. This council however is never mentioned in history except as that of the Ἄμφικτύους; from which we may infer that while no individual member of it was called an Ἄμφικτύων, the proper style of the members collectively was that of Οἱ Ἄμφικτύους. And that being the case, the first clue to the origin of the institution may probably be derivable from the etymon and meaning of its proper name.

Neither this name of Ἄμφικτύους, nor that of Ἄμφικτίους, occurs in the Greek language as an appellative; but if Ἄμφικτίους had occurred, it would have been analogous to Περικτίους; and Περικτίους, as an appellative, in the sense of Περίοικοι, Περιουκούντες, Περιναέται, and what is identical with it, Περικτίται, are of frequent occurrence<sup>18</sup>. And that the ancient grammarians had no difficulty in deriving Ἄμφικτύους from Ἄμφικτίους, as synonymous with Περικτίους, appears from the Etymol. M.: Ἄμφικτίους· οἱ περιουκούντες. τὸ γὰρ κτίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκίσαι ἔλαβον οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὡς φησιν Ὅμηρος·

ἔυκτιμένον ποτλίεθρον.

ἔστιν οὖν οἰκίξω οἰκίσω, οἰκίων καὶ οἰκτιών, κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ τ, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀμφι προθέσεως ἀμφικτιών, καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ ι εἰς υ ἀμφικτύων. Without vouching however for the formation of the term exactly after such a process as this, still we may observe that, in explaining the word itself by περίοικοι or περιουκούντες, the best and most judicious of the old grammarians agreed with the Etymologicum<sup>19</sup>. And this being the acknowledged meaning of the term, it follows that it must have denoted from the first the members of an union or confederation, all of whom collectively, and each in particular, stood in a very definite relation to something else, but a relation eminently local—the relation of parties in a certain association, who lived round about some common centre.

The scholiasts and commentators of antiquity, who lived and wrote at a time when the Amphictyonic council was so generally known by nothing as by its relation to the temple at Delphi and the Pythian Apollo, naturally fell into the mistake of construing this relation to a certain locality and a certain centre, implied in the name itself, of their relation to the temple at Delphi; as if the council and its component parts had been so called originally because they lived *round about* the temple of Delphi. But this explanation of the name in general would very inadequately account for its application to each of the component parts of the council in particular, many of whom are known to have been members of it from the first, who could not be said to have lived round about Delphi in any sense. It is sufficient however to shew the historical falsehood of this explanation, to remind the reader that, as we ourselves have already proved, the temple at Delphi and the Pythian Apollo were not older than B. C. 1222; the Am-

<sup>17</sup> Strabo, ix. 3. 278, 279: Scholia in Eurip. ad Orest. 1087.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Iliad. P. 220: Σ. 212: T. 104. 109: Od. B. 65: A. 287: Hymn to

Apollo, 274: Apollon. Rhod. iii. 1089.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Hesychius, Harpocration, Suidas, Ἄμφικτύους: Pausanias, x. viii. 1-3.



phtietyonic institution, according to the Parian Marble<sup>20</sup>, was as old as B. C. 1522: and make what allowance we please for a possible error of excess in the antiquity thus assigned it, yet that it was much older than B. C. 1222, and the Pythian institution, cannot be doubted. And we hope to see reason hereafter to conclude that even this institution, so far from being older than the council, or independent of it, was purposely placed by its author, from the first, under the care and superintendence of the Amphictyons.

Here again then, in order to arrive at any clear and consistent idea of the first cause of or motive to the institution, and of the final end proposed by it, we must have recourse to the acknowledged facts of its history. As first, that while the states or communities, which by their union composed the council, were called collectively *οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες*, their representatives in the council were called *Πυλαγοῦραι*, the meetings themselves were called *Πυλαίαι*, and the place of these meetings was the ancient *Πύλαι* or *Θερμοπύλαι*<sup>21</sup>: and this last fact, it is evident, is the most important of all to the present question. The meetings of the council must have been called *Πυλαίαι*, and those who were deputed to them must have been called *Πυλαγοῦραι*, because the meetings themselves were held at *Πύλαι*. And *Πύλαι* or *Θερμοπύλαι* being at the very entrance of Thessaly, to what could these meetings, appointed to be held there, and there only, from the first, have had any reference except Thessaly?

If the tradition, relating to the origin of Thessaly, had any foundation in the matter of fact, the circumstances under which it came into existence as an habitable country may well be considered to have invested it with something like a sacred character from the first. A land which had been rescued from the element of water, and recovered to the use of man, by so remarkable an interposition of the providence of the gods, could scarcely have been regarded as common land. Besides which, while the change in its state of being was still a recent event, and men could not yet have forgotten what it had so long been—an immense lake, shut in on all sides by impervious mountains—there would naturally be at first a feeling of distrust in the permanency of the change, and an apprehension of danger from venturing too soon into the only lately evacuated dominion of the sea. Strabo observed that Thessaly was still liable to be inundated by the Peneus; and the first occurrence of such a phenomenon, after the surface of the country had been laid bare, would look like a return of the watery element to reassert its ancient jurisdiction.

<sup>20</sup> *Epocha v.*

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Hesychius, *Πυλαγοῦραι*: *Πυλαίαι* *ἀγοραὶ* (cf. *Soph. Trachin.* 639, and the *Schol.* in loc. *Schol.* in *Arist. ad Lysist.* 1133. *Nubes*, 623, 624): *Harpocration*, *Πύλαι κ'*, *Πυλαία*: *Πυλαγοῦραι*: *Photius* and *Suidas*, *Πυλαγοῦρας*: *Πύλαι*: *Πυλαία*: *Πυλαγοῦρας*: *Anecdota*, 292. 25. *Πυλαγοῦραι*: *Etym.*

*M. Πυλαγοῦραι*: *Æschines*, *De Falsa*, 120. 125: *Schol.* in *Dem.* 46. *Philipp.* i. 105. 7. *Eis Πύλας*: *Ibid.* 296. *De Pace.* 147. 6. *Πυλαίας*: *Ibid.* 310. *De Corona*, 112. 5. Also *Hesychius*, *Harpocration*, *Suidas*, *Photius*, *Etym.* *M. Anecdota* (266. 1.) in *Ἱερομνήμονες*. *Schol.* in *Dem.* 108. *De Corona*, 112. 21. *Ἱερομνήμονες*. Cf. 310 ad 112. 7.

On every account then it may be presumed that even after the plain of Thessaly had been recovered from the sea, and laid open to colonisation, settlers from without would neither very early nor very generally venture into it—especially into the interior of the country itself. As we have already suggested, if the Vale of the Spercheus, and the regions interjacent between Mount Othrys and Mount Cæta, originally made part of the same lake as the rest of Thessaly, and were themselves laid bare by the same convulsion of nature which drained the plain of Thessaly—it is far from improbable that the first to be occupied would be this district on the south of Mount Othrys. And though some settlers might find their way either through the Vale of Tempe, or the passes of the Cambunian mountains on the north, into the plain of Thessaly itself, (and those very probably the first of all, the founders of the tribe of the Ἑλλοῖ and of the Dodona of Homer, at the northern extremity of Thessaly,) yet the natural and obvious course of the tide of immigration would be through the pass of Thermopylæ—and the part of Thessaly itself first reclaimed and peopled would be the Vale of the Spercheus. It deserves to be mentioned, that as the geographical name of this valley in the course of time appears to have become that of Μηλῖς—so, on etymological principles, the meaning of Μηλῖς would be that of the land of Μηλα; and Μηλα, according to Hesychius, being the generic name for the productions of any kind of fruit trees in general, as well as of the apple in particular—this name might have been given to the district in question from the number and variety of fruit trees, which sprang up in it, as soon as it was subjected to the action of the air and the sun. Moreover, there appears to have been from the first a studied connection between the prize of the Pythian institution and the soil of Thessaly. When that prize became a crown of laurel, this laurel was purposely fetched from the Vale of Tempe. And as it is said to have been a crown of Μηλα, before it was one of laurel, what hinders but that we may suppose these Μηλα might be fetched from this region of Μηλῖς, as part of Thessaly too—and possibly *that* where such gifts of the gods to men first appeared \* ?

\* In like manner, as no explanation of the name of Δωπῖς (sc. γῆ) on etymological principles would be so natural and obvious as that which should derive it from δῶρον, a gift—and make it first and properly denote the land of the δῶρον, the gift-land—so it is evident none could have been more suitable to the whole or any part of a country, recovered and rendered available for the use and enjoyment of men, as the ancient Thessaly had been. And though no part of ancient Greece is known to have actually borne this name of Δωπῖς, except the country of the Dorians, and the Dorians, when first mentioned in history, are seen to have been living in Phocis or Locris, outside of Thessaly—yet as they were a migratory race, from a very early period too, their original birthplace might still have been within the limits of Thessaly, and their first settlement a part of the *gift-land*, in the Vale of the Spercheus, in the Melian district—from which they might themselves have derived their name, as the people of this land of the gift, or of so much of it as was occupied by themselves. For if the land, or any part of it,

That such at least was the state of the case, when the Amphictyonic council was first instituted; that little or no part of the plain of Thessaly had probably yet been occupied, except the settlement of the Έλλοί; and that the association consisted at first of those who were either still living outside of Thessaly, or only in the valley of the Spercheus, along the foot of Mount Othrys on the north, and Έτα on the south, and Pelion and Pindus on the west, may be argued from various considerations. i. From the place fixed upon for the meetings of the association, Pylæ, at the very entrance of this valley itself—which strongly implies that the peopling of the country was still confined to this Melian district, and had not yet extended far even into that. ii. From the language of the vth epoch on the Parian marble, (one of the few which have come down almost in their original integrity,) which records the institution itself: 'Α(φ' οὐδ' Ἀμφικτύων ὁ Δευκαλίωνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις, καὶ συνήγε (τ)οὺς περὶ τὸν ὄρον οὐκοῦντας, καὶ ὠ(νό)μασεν Ἀμφικτύονας, καὶ Π(υλαία)ν, οἰ(περ) καὶ νῦν ἔτι θύουσιν Ἀμφικτύονες, (ἔ)τη ΧΗΗΡΠΠΙ (1258), βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Ἀμφικτύονος.

Here the foundation of the institution indeed is attributed to Amphictyon, as if the personal act of some one man; but its real origin, as a voluntary association of a number of communities, all standing in the same relation to some centre of union in common, (from which too they derived their name,) is intimated in the description of those whom even this Amphictyon is supposed to have brought together—Τοὺς περὶ τὸν ὄρον οὐκοῦντας. For what can be the meaning of these words, but that of Those who were living round about the boundary? and what ὄρος or boundary could that be, serving as the centre of union to the various members of an association, appointed to meet at Pylæ, at the very entrance of Thessaly, except the ὄρος, the περιγραφῆ, the geographical outline and bounds of Thessaly itself—than which, no part of ancient Greece had more remarkable ones of their kind, or more clearly defined, in the mountainous barrier by which it was surrounded on all sides; and that too, whether restricted to the plain of Thessaly, or including the valley of the Spercheus also. Such language as this then, it is evident, could have properly denoted none but the members of an association composed of those who were living either within the pass of Thermopylæ, round about the external boundaries of the Great Plain of Thessaly, strictly so called, or without the pass of Thermopylæ, round about the exterior limits of the ancient Thessaly in general—or partly within and partly without the pass of Thermopylæ, yet exterior to the great plain of Thessaly, as the principal part of the country, too.

And that this latter was probably the real state of the case, as intended at first by this description, may be argued from the names and distinctions

from the special reasons of the case, was already called Δωρίς, before it was occupied by settlers of any kind, that they who first settled in it would get or assume the name of Δωριεῖς (the people of this Δωρίς) seems to follow as matter of course.

of the actual members of the association, (that is, of the states or communities which composed it from the first,) concerning whom it seems to be agreed that they did not originally exceed twelve in number<sup>22</sup>, and it is probable they were not even so many. Three lists of these names have been handed down—one in Æschines<sup>23</sup>, one in Harpocration<sup>24</sup>, and one in Pausanias<sup>25</sup>—which it is worth while to compare together.

*Lists of the Members of the Amphictyonic Council.*

Æschines.	Harpocration.	Pausanias.
i Θετταλοὶ	i Ἴωνες	i Ἴωνες
ii Βοιωτοὶ	ii Δωριεῖς	ii Δόλοπες
iii Δωριεῖς	iii Περραιβοὶ	iii Θεσσαλοὶ
iv Ἴωνες	iv Βοιωτοὶ	iv Αἰνιᾶνες
v Περραιβοὶ	v Μάγνητες	v Μάγνητες
vi Μάγνητες	vi Ἀχαιοὶ	vi Μαλιεῖς
vii Λοκροὶ	vii Φθιώται	vii Φθιώται
viii Οἰταῖοι	viii Μηλιεῖς	viii Δωριεῖς
ix Φθιώται	ix Δόλοπες	ix Φωκεῖς
x Μαλιεῖς	x Αἰνιᾶνες	x Λοκροὶ ἐπὶ Κνημίδι.
xi Φωκεῖς	xi Δελφοὶ	
(xii) Θηβαῖοι.	xii Φωκεῖς.	

Of these names, we should not hesitate to strike out those of the Ἴωνες, the Θεσσαλοὶ, the Δελφοὶ, and very possibly that of the Βοιωτοί—as subsequent additions to the original list. Of the rest, all are the names of nations which either lived outside of the ancient Thessaly—but contiguous to it—the Περραιβοὶ on the north, the Μάγνητες on the east, the Φωκεῖς, Δωριεῖς, and Λοκροὶ ἐπικνημίδιοι on the south and west—or if within the limits of Thessaly, only in this intermediate tract of country between mount Ceta on the south and mount Othrys on the north, the Οἰταῖοι, Φθιώται, Μαλιεῖς, Ἀχαιοὶ, Δόλοπες, and Αἰνιᾶνες. And these alone constitute half of the names in the above lists.

For these reasons, we can come to no other conclusion respecting the origin of the Amphictyonic Council, but *this*, viz. that it was probably in the first instance a voluntary union of the inhabitants of the Vale of the Spercheus, within the pass of Thermopylæ, and of some, if not all, of the communities, planted and living at the same time without the pass of Thermopylæ, round about the ancient Thessaly; the final end and object of which had some special and exclusive reference to the Great Plain of Thessaly, as a kind of sacred enclosure, the direct and immediate gift of the gods—probably at first, with a view to the maintenance of the rights,

<sup>22</sup> Schol. in Pind. ad Pyth. iv. 116: Harpocration, Ἀμφικτύονες: Æschines, De Falsa, 112: Strabo. ix. 3. 278, 279.

<sup>23</sup> ii. (De Falsa,) 121.

<sup>24</sup> Ἀμφικτύονες: cf. Libanius, iii. 414, l. lxiv. Παρὰ Δημοσθένους κατ' Αἰσχίνου Πυλαγόρου. Also Diodor. xvi. 24: Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. iv. 25.

<sup>25</sup> x. viii. 1.

privileges, and immunities which might be supposed to belong to it in that capacity, and possibly with an ultimate and prospective reference to its occupation and colonisation, and to the carrying out of that, in due course of time, after an orderly manner. And, could the communities of which it consisted at first be supposed to have already existed at so early a period, there would be no reason *a priori* why an association, projected with such objects as these in view, might not have been formed even at the date assigned it by the Parian Chronicle, B. C. 1522, 59 years at least later than our assumed date of the Natalis of Thessaly itself, B. C. 1582 or 1581. But this could not be taken for granted; and this date of the Council on the Marble is more properly that of Amphictyon, the supposed founder of the institution, who, in any such relation to it, can be regarded only as a fictitious character.

With regard to the real date of the Council; all that can be assumed with absolute certainty is that it must have been older than that of the Pythian institution, B. C. 1222; and all that can be assumed with a degree of probability approaching to certainty is that it must have been older than the Eleusinian Correction of Eumolpus, and the Thesmophorian Correction of Triptolemus, B. C. 1310. For of the facts of the history of the institution from the first, none is better attested than *this*; that among the objects of the national worship of the Greeks in after-times, the only one recognised by the Amphictyonic Council must have been *Δημήτηρ*. The meetings of the Council at Pylæ were held in the temple of *Δημήτηρ*, and its proceedings, as often as it met, were ushered in by a sacrifice to *Δημήτηρ*<sup>26</sup>; but, for anything known to the contrary, to none of the gods besides. It appears to us a natural inference from these facts, that the only object of the national worship, as yet in existence when this became the rule of the Council, was the Amphictyonic *Δημήτηρ*; and it is certain that, among the gods or goddesses of the classical Olympus, none was older than *Δημήτηρ*: and none of the gods or goddesses of the Greeks, in any sense, could claim precedence over her in that respect, except the *Ἐρικαία* of Cadmus, or the *Ἀθηνᾶ* of Erichthonius; each of whom however was more properly an Egyptian conception of its kind than an Hellenic one. And this being the case, if the Amphictyonic *Δημήτηρ* was not older than the Amphictyonic institution, the Amphictyonic Council must have been older than its own *Δημήτηρ*. And, in our opinion, though the first introduction of the name and worship of the Grecian *Δημήτηρ* was the doing of the founders of the Eleusinia and the Thesmophoria respectively, the real authors of her general recognition and reception among the Greeks were the Amphictyons; and this, and this only, is the true explanation of the very peculiar relation in which they themselves appear to have stood from the first to this one of the objects of the national worship in after-times, and to none besides; viz. that she was probably first recognised by them at a time when there was none other.

It is a strong confirmation of this conclusion that tradition attributed

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Herod. vii. 200: Strabo, ix. 4. 293 b.

the foundation of this temple of Demeter, at Pylæ, to Acrisius<sup>27</sup>, and tradition attributed the foundation of the council also to Acrisius<sup>28</sup>; and there is good reason to believe that, if the council was not founded in his time, it was reconstituted, and put on a larger and more comprehensive footing, in his time, and very probably through his instrumentality, and his influence with his contemporaries, as the most powerful prince of his time. And as to the age of Acrisius, Eurystheus, according to Homer, was born at the same time as Hercules, whose birth we have determined to B. C. 1260<sup>29</sup>; and between Eurystheus and Acrisius he supposes only three generations, Sthenelus the father of Eurystheus, and Perseus the father of Sthenelus, and Danaë the mother of Perseus<sup>30</sup>. On this supposition, there might not have been more than 72 years between Eurystheus and Acrisius<sup>31</sup>; which would give the acme of Acrisius B. C. 1332, only 22 years earlier than the Eleusinian correction of Eumolpus, or the Thesmophorian one of Triptolemus, B. C. 1310: so that nothing could have been more possible *a priori* than that he in particular might have taken a prominent part both in the reconstruction and enlargement of the Amphictyonic institution, before B. C. 1310, and in the recognition and reception of the Eleusinian and Thesmophorian Demeter, as its proper object of worship in its collective capacity, and through it of the Greeks in general\*, after that date.

\* The names which occur in Homer for the Greeks collectively, and in the same sense which is now attached to the term Ἕλληνες, as Thucydides observed long ago<sup>a</sup>, are these three, Δαναοί, Ἀργεῖοι, and Ἀχαιοί: and though each of these occurs so often in the Iliad or the Odyssey, that, at first sight, no one could venture to say which was more frequently used than another, yet, according to an actual comparison, such as Mr. Gladstone appears to have instituted<sup>b</sup>, while the word Δαναοί occurs 160 times, and that of Ἀργεῖοι 205 times, that of Ἀχαιοί occurs seven or eight hundred times.

With respect to the first of these three designations of the Greeks in general, there can be little doubt it must have been derived from the name of Δαναός, and must have denoted first and properly the followers of Danaus, who settled along with him in the Peloponnese; and only by metonymy the rest of the inhabitants of that country, and much more the Greeks in general: and the repeated use of this term by Homer, and in this sense, is one among the other corroborative proofs of the truth of the tradition relating to the settlement of a colony from Egypt under Danaus, in the Peloponnese, and that it was both known to, and believed by, Homer.

In like manner the name of Ἀργεῖοι must have been derived from Ἄργος, in the sense of the city of Argos, and must have first and properly denoted the people

<sup>27</sup> Callimachus, Epigramm. xli. cf. Mr. Clinton, F. H. i. 75 note g.

<sup>28</sup> Schol. in Orest. ad v. 1087: Strabo, ix. 3. 278, 279: Pausan. vii. xxiv. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Vol. iv. 550.

<sup>30</sup> Iliad, Ξ. 319: T. 122.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. vol. iv. 549—the age of Alcmena at the birth of Hercules.

It follows, as a corollary, from these conclusions, that such being the probable origin and the early history of the council, the stated time of its meetings from the first could be none so properly as the Natalis of Thessaly, the date of the Peloria, the 17th of the primitive Mesore—and from the time of the institution of the council, to the date of the Pythian institution, the rule of its proceedings would probably be to meet once in the

of Ἄργος; and the city of Ἄργος having been founded by Danaus, the Ἀργεῖοι, in the first and proper sense of the term, must have been synonymous with Δαναοί. And it is very observable that in one instance<sup>c</sup>—

Ἀργείων Δαναῶν ἦδ' Ἰλίου οἶτον ἀκούων—

Homer seems to have used one of them as explanatory of the other, meaning either the Ἀργεῖοι, who were also Δαναοί, or the Δαναοί, who were also Ἀργεῖοι. And from this proper sense of the people of Ἄργος he has transferred the same word Ἀργεῖοι to that of the Greeks in general, just as he has the name of Ἄργος, from its first but limited sense of the city of Argos, or of the region round about, to the Peloponnese in general, or to large portions of it, or of other parts of Greece, in particular.

But with respect to the name of Ἀχαιοί, the etymon and meaning of that one of these three national designations, in the idiom of Homer, at first sight, are not so apparent; nor in fact has any explanation of it been proposed which can be pronounced satisfactory. Perhaps however the fact, which we have just been considering, the adoption of the worship of Δημήτηρ by the Amphictyonic council, in the name and on the behalf of the Greeks collectively, B. C. 1310, or soon after, may supply this desideratum. The most characteristic title of the Δημήτηρ, both of the Eleusinian and of the Thesmophorian mysteries, as we have seen<sup>d</sup>, was that of the Ἀχαιά; and the goddess Ἀχαιά having once been recognised by public authority as the object of the national worship among the Greeks, whether any such name as that of the Ἀχαιοί, and for any such reason as because they were the worshippers of the Ἀχαιά, was adopted at the same time and imposed on themselves by the members of the Amphictyonic council or not, the mere fact that, from this time to his own, all the Greeks agreed in this one circumstance of distinction, that they were the worshippers of the Ἀχαιά, would be quite reason enough why Homer should have adopted this name in particular as the most characteristic designation of his countrymen in general, and have used it, as he is seen to have done in the Iliad and the Odyssey, so much more frequently than any other. Especially, if his own religious creed, (as we ourselves cannot help suspecting,) in the unity and simplicity of the object of worship recognised by it, agreed with that of Eumolpus or Triptolemus, and acknowledged no divine principle but their Δημήτηρ. Certain at least it is, that though he could not have been ignorant of the existence both of the Eleusinian and of the Thesmophorian mysteries in his own time, he has nowhere alluded to them; and among the other objects of the national faith and worship in after-times, Demeter is the only one with respect to whose name and person and agency he has maintained a religious reserve and reverence, which strongly contrast the freedoms taken both in the Iliad and the Odyssey with those of the rest of the inmates of the classical Olympus.

<sup>c</sup> Od. O. 578.

<sup>d</sup> Supra, vol. iv. 297.

year, on the 17th of the last month in the primitive calendar, at Thermopylæ; but from the date of the Pythian institution, if that too was placed under its care from the first, its rule would probably be to meet every year as before, on the 17th of the last month, at Thermopylæ, and once every eight years, on the date of the Pythian solemnity, August 26, at Delphi.

iii. The flood of Deucalion, and the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι* of the Attic calendar. The accounts of the flood of Deucalion, as handed down traditionally, are calculated to lead to very different conclusions respecting the nature of the event itself. To judge from one class of these accounts, the flood of Deucalion must have been the traditionary counterpart of the Deluge of Noah; and Deucalion himself the representative of the patriarch Noah. According to this account, Deucalion is the son or grandson of Prometheus, and Pyrrha his wife is the daughter of Epimetheus (the brother of Prometheus) and Pandora; and Pandora, being the first of her sex, and the work of the gods themselves, must have been the Eve of Scripture. On this principle the proper æra of the Deucalion of this tradition is that of the world before the flood. His proper contemporaries must have been the last survivors of the antediluvian world; and his proper historical prototype must have been the last of the antediluvian patriarchs. And the facts of his history *mutatis mutandis* agree with those of the Noah of Scripture. Deucalion is warned by Prometheus of the futurity of the flood; as Noah was warned by God. Deucalion is influenced by that warning, as Noah was by that of God, to prepare an ark for his own preservation, and that of other living creatures with him. Deucalion rides safely in this ark on the waters of *his* flood, as Noah did in his on the waters of the Deluge of Scripture. The facts of the sojourn of Deucalion in *his* ark, while it lasts, as handed down by tradition, are those of the sojourn of Noah in the ark of Scripture; particularly what is related of each concerning the sendings out and the returns of the dove<sup>32</sup>. The ark of Deucalion rests on the top of a mountain, as the ark of Noah did. The destruction of life by the flood of Deucalion is universal, as that by the deluge of Noah was: and the founder of life and being—especially of human life and being—*anew*, after his own flood, is Deucalion himself, as the patriarch Noah was after the deluge of Scripture. The first act of Deucalion, when his flood is over and he descends from his ark, is to sacrifice to Zeus<sup>33</sup>; and the first act of Noah, under the same circumstances, was to sacrifice to God<sup>34</sup>. Even the name of *Δευκαλίων* appears to have been ultimately derived from the Scripture name of Noah, or the facts of the history of Noah\*, which are known to us at present only from

\* *Δευκαλίων* may be regarded as a patronymic, derived from *Δεύκαλος*, according to the same analogy as *Οὐρανίων* from *Οὐρανός* or *Κρονίων* from *Κρόνος*. *Δευκαλίδης*, which would be the regular form of such a patronymic, occurs in Homer <sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Il. M. 117: N. 307: P. 608. cf. Hesych. *Δευκαλίδαι*: Etym. M. *Ἄνθεμιδης*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. our *Fasti Catholici* ii. 185 n.

<sup>33</sup> Apollodor. *Bibl.* i. vii. § 2 sqq. Cf. Schol. in Apollon. Rh. ad iii. 1084 sqq. Pausanias, i. viii 7: ii. xxi. 1.

<sup>34</sup> Gen. viii. 20.



Scripture, but to the postdiluvians might have been for a long time known everywhere from tradition.

Again, to judge from the other class of these same traditionary accounts of the flood of Deucalion, it could have been nothing but a local inundation, limited in the sphere of its extent, and partial in its operation and effects; and what is more, with a distinct relation to the ancient Thessaly and the circumjacent regions. According to Aristotle the flood of Deuca-

Δεῦκαλος in like manner would be derivable from δεῦκος, after the same manner as τροχαλὸς from τρώχος, κρόταλον from κρότος, κροκαλαί from κροκαί, and the like: and whatsoever the idea implied in δεῦκος, the same would be implied or expressed in δεῦκαλος. And though δεῦκος, in that form, is not of common occurrence in Greek, yet that there must have been such a term in that language, and that it must have carried with it the idea of γλεῦκος, sweetness, may be inferred from the adjective ἀδέυκης<sup>b</sup> (compounded of a privative and δεῦκος) in the sense of πικρὸς, bitter, and from the proper name first given to one of the Dioscuri, but otherwise of common occurrence in Greek, Πολυδεύκης, which must have been compounded of πολλὸς and δεῦκος, and carried with it the idea and signification of "much sweetness."

On this principle, Δευκαλίων, as the son of Δεῦκαλος, would be *a priori* capable of denoting the "son of sweetness." Now the names of the patriarchs in the original Hebrew all had a meaning of a certain kind in themselves, by virtue of which they might be regarded, if necessary, as appellatives, as much as proper names; and this appellative signification of the name of Noah in particular, it appears from Scripture<sup>c</sup>, was that of ἀνάπαυσις, refreshment, rest, or comfort: and the son of refreshment, the son of comfort, and the son of sweetness, on this principle, would be only a more general mode of expressing the name of the patriarch Noah.

The name of Δευκαλίων however, even as carrying with it this idea of the son of sweetness, and as purposely so framed and expressed in accommodation to the facts of the personal history of the patriarch Noah, in our opinion, was not taken from the name of Noah, as given him and explained at the time of his birth<sup>d</sup>, but rather from that occasion in his history when the full meaning of his name may be said to have been first cleared up by the event the occasion related<sup>e</sup> of the first sacrifice after the flood, and the descent from the ark.

No incident in the history of the deluge, before or after, was more likely to be remembered than this; the covenant with Noah, and through him with every living thing which went out of the ark, the promise that the world should never again be destroyed in the same way, and the permission to make use of animal food, having all been the consequences of this one act. Now, the acceptableness of that sacrifice in the idiom of Scripture being expressed by God's smelling a smell of sweet savour, (or as it is in the original, a savour or smell of sweetness,) in our opinion, this act alone, and its consequences while they were still remembered, would be competent to gain Noah, with the postdiluvian world, and in conformity to the modes of thought and speech, so characteristic of the east, this peculiar name of the "son of sweetness"—the very same, which, as we have endeavoured to shew, must have been implied in that of Δευκαλίων.

<sup>b</sup> Cf. the Etym. M. in voce.      <sup>c</sup> Gen. v. 29. cf. also the Septuagint, Gen. v. 29.

<sup>d</sup> Gen. v. 29.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. viii. 18-22.

lion was the effect of natural causes, liable *a priori* to produce such effects at stated times, but not always in the same quarter; and in this instance determined by circumstances to what he calls the ancient Hellas, in Acarnania or Epirus. 'Ἀλλὰ πάντων τούτων αἴτιον ὑποληπτέον, ὅτι γίγνεται διὰ χρόνων εἰμαρμένων οἷον ἐν ταῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ὥραις χειμῶν, οὕτω περιόδου τινὸς μεγάλης μέγας χειμῶν, καὶ ὑπερβολῇ ὄμβρων. αὕτη δ' οὐκ αἰεὶ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τόπους, ἀλλ' ὡσπερ ὁ καλούμενος ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμός· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος περὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ἐγένετο μάλιστα τόπον, καὶ τούτου περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν ἀρχαίαν· αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἢ περὶ Δωδώνην καὶ τὸν Ἀχελῶν· οὗτος γὰρ πολλαχοῦ τὸ ῥεῦμα μεταβέβληκεν. ὄκουν γὰρ οἱ Σελλοὶ ἐνταῦθα, καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τότε μὲν Γραῖκοι νῦν δὲ Ἕλληες<sup>35</sup>.

According to the Parian Marble<sup>36</sup> Deucalion himself was reigning in Lycorea when his flood occurred: according to Pausanias, and the ancient tradition reported by him<sup>37</sup>, Lycorea itself was built on the summits of mount Parnassus, by the survivors of the deluge (of Deucalion), who had been directed to the spot by the howling of wolves, retreating before the same inundation as themselves. In any case, the chief sufferers by this flood of Deucalion were mount Parnassus and the circumjacent region, Phocis and Locris. The ark of Deucalion grounded on mount Parnassus, and Deucalion himself descended from it either there<sup>38</sup>, or on mount Othrys in Thessaly<sup>39</sup>, or at Κύνος<sup>40</sup> among the Opuntian Locrians<sup>41</sup>.

It is manifest therefore that, in these different accounts, the deluge of Scripture, which was universal, and some other visitation of the same kind, which was local and partial, must have been confounded together; and the question is how to account for this confusion on the assumption that there was an equal foundation in history and tradition for both these representations. And, in our opinion, the only probable explanation is the fact, which appears to have been perpetuated by tradition also, that the same convulsion of nature which emptied the plain of Thessaly was the cause also of the so-called flood of Deucalion.

Προμηθεὺς δὲ παῖς, says Apollodorus<sup>42</sup>, Δευκαλίων ἐγένετο. οὗτος βασιλεύων τῶν περὶ τὴν Φθίαν τόπων γιμεί Πύρραν τὴν Ἐπιμηθεὺς καὶ Πανδώρας, ἦν ἔπλασαν θεοὶ πρώτην γυναῖκα. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀφανίσαι Ζεὺς τὸ χαλκοῦν γένος ἠθέλησεν, ὑποθεμένου Προμηθεὺς Δευκαλίων τεκτηνόμενος λάρνακα, καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἐνθήμενος, εἰς ταύτην μετὰ Πύρρας εἰσέβη. Ζεὺς δὲ πολὺν ὑέτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ χέας τὰ πλείστα μέρη τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατέκλυσε, ὥστε διαφθαρῆναι πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὀλίγων χωρὶς, οἳ συνέφυγον εἰς τὰ πλησίον ὑψηλὰ ὄρη. τότε δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ Θεσσαλίαν ὄρη διέστη, καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ Πελοποννήσου συνεχύθη πάντα. Δευκαλίων δὲ ἐν τῇ λάρνακι διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης φερόμενος ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἐννέα καὶ νύκτας ἴσας, τῷ Παρνασσῷ προσίσχει, κάκει τῶν ὄμβρων παῦλαν λαβόντων, ἐκβὰς θύει Διὶ Φυξίῳ κ', τ. λ.

The most important part of this account is the observation, parentheti-

<sup>35</sup> Meteorolog. i. 14. 31, 30.

<sup>36</sup> Epocha iv.

<sup>37</sup> x. vi. 1. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Apollod. Bibl. i. vii. 2. Ovid.

Metam. i. 313.

<sup>39</sup> Pind. Ol. ix. 64, and the Schol.

<sup>40</sup> Strabo, ix. 4. 287. cf. Il. B. 331.

<sup>41</sup> Pind. Ol. ix. 64, and the Schol.

<sup>42</sup> Bibl. i. vii. 2 sqq.

cally as it were interposed—*Τότε δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ Θεσσαλίαν ὄρη διέστη*—and the supposed effect of that coincidence, a deluge of waters thrown over the outlying region beyond the precincts of Thessaly, which overwhelmed everything as far as the Isthmus and the Peloponnese. For that such would be the necessary consequence of the discharge of the waters of Thessaly not only between mount Olympus and Ossa, on the north-east, where they were contiguous to the sea, but also through the passes of mount Ossa and Pelion, on the south-east, and those of Pindus on the west—if all these were opened for the first time by the same convulsion of nature—requires no argument to prove. That a local deluge therefore would accompany this convulsion, until the waters of Thessaly, now for the first time liberated, had relieved themselves by falling into the sinus Corinthiacus on one side, and the sinus Maliacus or Euboicus on another, as much as into the sinus Thermaicus, and if it did, that the sphere of its operation would be precisely that which tradition, in one of its accounts of the flood of Deucalion, appears to have assigned to *that*, as a local visitation of its kind, and restricted to the parts on the west and south of Thessaly, may be taken for granted also\*.

These distinctions then, between the traditionary accounts of the flood of Deucalion, and the consequent difference in the nature or extent of that visitation, having been pointed out; let us now proceed to consider the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι* of the Attic Calendar.

These *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι* were so called because they were supposed to represent the days of the flood of Deucalion. They were the assumed date of that flood in the Correction of Solon<sup>43</sup>. The first thing therefore to be considered is the date to which they were attached in that Correction; the next is the Julian date to which this Attic one, in the year of the Correction, corresponded. Now the calendar date of the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι* was the 13th of Anthesterion<sup>43</sup>; and the Julian date of Anthesterion 13, Period i. 1, Cycle i. 1 of the Correction of Solon, was March 1. This Julian date of the days in question then being supposed to have been older than this Attic one of the same from the time of Solon downwards, and Anthesterion 13 to have been purposely fixed upon as this date in the year of the Correction, because it was coinciding at that time with March 1; the

\* And here the reader may be reminded of the fact, which we learnt supra, Vol. iv. 123-125, from the traditionary circumstances relating to the contest between Posidon and Athena, for the possession of Attica; viz. that the decision of that contest in favour of Athena was followed by a partial deluge of Attica, in the direction of the Campus Thriasius, attributed to the anger of Posidon. The date of this contest, and that of the discharge of the waters of the lake of Thessaly, both went so far back into antiquity, that if the effect of this latter was actually felt in the parts of Attica nearest to Thessaly, the inundation or deluge so produced would be very liable *a priori* to pass with posterity for the consequence of the resentment of Posidon, at the termination of his dispute with Athena.

question which next presents itself is this, On what principle could the date of the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι*, as that of the flood of Deucalion, have come, before the time of Solon, to be fixed to March 1?

In answer to this question, we observe, That the true date of the flood of Deucalion having been that of the Thessalian Peloria, and that of the Thessalian Peloria having been Mesore 17, and Mesore 17 having been a cyclical date, liable *a priori* to coincide first with one Julian term and then with another—if the date of the flood of Deucalion was ever attached to March 1, it must have been when Mesore 17 was coinciding with March 1. Let us then inquire when that would first be the case, *after* the date of the Peloria itself, Mesore 17, *Æra Cyc.* 2425, August 26, B. C. 1581.

Now if Mesore 17 is to coincide with March 1, the first Epagomene must coincide with March 15, and Thoth 1 with March 20: and the first time when each of these things was the case, *after* the date of the Peloria, and *before* the Correction of Solon, as our General Tables shew, was *Æra Cyc.* 3165–3166, A. M. 3164, B. C. 841. Thoth 1, *Æra Cyc.* 3166, at that time was falling on March 20—and Mesore 17, *Æra Cyc.* 3165, was falling on March 1—A. M. 3164, B. C. 841.

Let us next enquire when each of these things was last the case, *after* the beginning of things, but *before* the date of the Peloria. Our Tables also shew that this must have been *Æra Cyclica* 1657–1658, A. M. 1657, B. C. 2348—that Thoth 1, *Æra Cyc.* 1658, coincided at that time with March 20, and Mesore 17 with March 1, A. M. 1657, B. C. 2348. Now this latter year is remarkable in each of these æras. It is in each alike the year of the Deluge of Scripture itself<sup>44</sup>. It follows that the last occasion *before* the date of the Peloria, when Mesore 17 was coinciding with March 1, was that of the Deluge itself; and the first occasion *after* the same date, when it was again coinciding with March 1, was the first occasion, later than the year of the Deluge, when equable time was returning to the very same relations to Julian, as those of the year of the Deluge itself—*Æra Cyc.* 3165–3166, A. M. 3164, B. C. 841.

We should probably greatly mistake the habits of thought and feeling of the men of these times, were we to suppose that while any recollection of such an event as the Deluge continued to be preserved among them, a coincidence like this would be allowed to pass by unnoticed. On the contrary, next to that of the return of equable time to the relations of origination, and to the traditionary date of the *Natale Mundi* itself, none would be more likely to attract their attention than this.

When therefore we consider that, among the Greeks in particular, a local visitation in the form of an inundation, produced by the sudden discharge of the waters of the lake of Thessaly, had already begun to be identified, under the name of the flood of Deucalion, with the Deluge of Scripture, and consequently the proper date of the former, Mesore 17, with that of the latter, (which also was the 17th of the month,) it will not appear surprising that the date of the Deluge, thus assumed to have been Mesore 17,

<sup>44</sup> *Fasti Catholici*, ii. 166 sqq.

should have been first fixed to a Julian date, when Mesore 17 in the equable style was returning to the same relations to Julian, as Mesore 17 in the year of the Deluge; and consequently falling on March 1, B.C. 841, as Mesore 17 had done B.C. 2348. And this having once been done, and at this time, and probably by the authority of the Amphictyonic council—we require nothing but that fact to account for the date of the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι*, in the correction of Solon, 249 years after, Anthesterion 13. This date in his calendar in itself is something remarkable, as being the third and last of the three days of the Dionysia Lenæa, the *Πιθοίγια*, *Χόες*, and *Χύτροι*—on none of which, it might have been supposed *a priori*, would such a date, as the first of these *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι*, have been allowed to fall, could it possibly have been prevented; i. e. if it had not otherwise been indissolubly attached to this Julian term of March 1, to which Anthesterion 13, in the year of the Correction, was determined also.

It remains only to observe that the period of these *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι*, in the Attic calendar, according to the representations of the grammarians of antiquity, was one of seven days<sup>45</sup>; and the relation of the Feralia of the Romans to these days in the Attic calendar, which we had occasion to explain and illustrate in our *Origg. Kal. Italicæ*<sup>45</sup>, is demonstrative that their recognised length in the Attic calendar, B. C. 450 or 449, was still a period of seven days. The duration of the Flood of Deucalion, according to Apollodorus<sup>46</sup>, was nine days; and that might have been historically true of the Thessalian inundation—or it may have been imagined simply in imitation of the Nine-days period, of such frequent occurrence in Homer, during which anything remarkable of its kind was going on. This seven-days' term of the *Μιαρὰ ἡμέραι* (that being assumed as the legitimate measure of their duration) is observable as being that of the hebdomadal cycle, the recollection of which too was very likely *a priori* to be mixed up with that of the Deluge, through the fact, which might have been long remembered, that the Deluge itself was preceded by such a cycle or interval of seven days, between the 10th of the month, when Noah entered the ark, and the 17th, when the flood began.

iv. The relation of the last month in the primitive Greek calendar to Posidon. The name of the last month in the first lunar correction of the Greeks, derived from the primitive solar calendar, as we have seen<sup>47</sup>, was Posideon—and Posideon, *virtute termini*, denoted the month of Posidon—the month, which as its name alone implied, for some reason or other, was sacred to Posidon. And though the name of Posideon might have been actually given to the xiith month of the primitive calendar only by Solon, and only when the xiith of the primitive solar passed into the xiith of the lunar calendar, we shall see proof hereafter that, for some reason or other, the last month in the primitive solar calendar was considered sacred to Posidon, even *in* the time, and *before* the time, of Homer.

Now some explanation of the fact, that one month of the primitive equable calendar, and as it appears only one, so long before the time of

<sup>45</sup> Cf. our *Origg. Kal. Italicæ*, i. 424 sqq.

<sup>46</sup> *Supra*, pag. 746.

<sup>47</sup> *Supra*, Vol. i. 123.

Solon, should have been considered peculiarly sacred to one, and only one, of the Powers or Principles recognised by the Greeks as divine, and that Power the one which presided over the element of water, and was the sole or the principal agent in all those effects of which the inherent forces, either in the earth or the sea, were the instrumental means, may well be considered a desideratum. And what is so competent to supply it as the tradition relating to the origin of the ancient Thessaly, the sudden conversion of an immense lake of water into an habitable country—mediately by an earthquake, ultimately and really, by Posidon, if, according to the reasoning of Herodotus<sup>48</sup>, all earthquakes were the work of Posidon? It is no wonder that, after the divinity of the classical Posidon had been universally recognised among the Greeks, the greatest and most stupendous display of the power and goodness of the gods in behalf of the Greeks, by bringing into existence for their use and enjoyment so rich and fertile a country as the ancient Thessaly, out of the element of water, and through the instrumentality of those subterraneous forces, which are concerned in the production of earthquakes, in the common opinion and belief should have been ascribed to Posidon, and the month in which it happened should have been stamped and characterised as his by the nature of the event itself, and ultimately have been called by his name.

\* This later tradition, which ascribed the recovery of Thessaly to the interference of Posidon, is not inconsistent with the much more probable opinion, for the time of Philammon in general, which might have ascribed it to the Sun; or with his own in particular, which might have ascribed it to his own Apollo, as the same with the Sun. See *supra*, p. 730. And it might confirm him in this opinion, that the epoch of his Pythian Cycle, and the Natalis of his Apollo, though supposed to have come into existence together *de facto*, only Aug. 26, B. C. 1222, on the principle of the *reditus retro*, applicable to every cycle, might just as well have done so Aug. 26, B. C. 1582.

<sup>48</sup> *Supra*, pag. 721.







5535

HGr

C

Author ..Greswell, Edward

Title ..Origines Kalendarisæ hellenicæ: Vol. V.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY

—  
Do not  
remove  
the card  
from this  
Pocket.  
—

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

